

Mabel I. Linson, South Solon, Ohio, in place of Emma Duff, retired.

OREGON

Dorothy L. Halverson, Lacombe, Oreg., in place of W. J. Bird, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William S. Simpson, Jr., Iva, S. C., in place of S. E. Leverette, retired.
Emily K. Bishop, Port Royal, S. C., in place of F. W. Scheper, retired.

TENNESSEE

John B. Overstreet, Celina, Tenn., in place of A. J. Dale, deceased.

TEXAS

Napoleon B. Ballard, Baytown, Tex., in place of E. M. Thomas, resigned.
Robert A. Runyon, Brownsville, Tex., in place of J. A. O'Brien, deceased.
Alfred M. Weir, McAllen, Tex., in place of H. S. Merts, resigned.

UTAH

Edward W. Vendell, Ogden, Utah, in place of R. B. Porter, retired.

VIRGINIA

David W. Paulette, Farmville, Va., in place of J. A. Garland, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anne M. Bailey, Kingston, W. Va., in place of D. W. Proffit, removed.

WISCONSIN

Laura E. Maxfield, Brownstown, Wis., in place of E. L. White, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose presence our souls take delight, consider and hear our humble prayer. Thy ways are in the deep and mighty waters, yet Thy hand is over us in divine love.

Thou hast not promised us to withhold affliction, calm without storm, or sun without a cloud, but Thou hast vouchsafed unto us a divine sympathy and an unfaltering strength whose heights and depths give triumph on the battlefields of life. Blessed be Thy holy name. O let Thy wisdom be our guide, Thy service our ambition, and Thy peace our richest possession. In the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article by a former Member of the House, Mr. Pettengill, and also an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to a constituent.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

STEEL EXPORTS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have two pieces of paper here in my hand that I think tell quite an interesting story. The first is an advertisement appearing in the Commercial Journal of recent date, and it reads as follows:

We offer, as representatives of a leading European mill, API line pipe, 300-500 tons monthly, commencing October. Kurt Orban Co., Inc., 17 Battery Place, New York City.

The other thing I should like to read is section 112 of Public Law 472:

The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy; and (2) avoid imperiling the fulfillment of the vital needs of the people of the United States.

I believe we ought to have a so-called watchdog committee. Such a committee should look for just this sort of thing. It is obvious that as we are shipping about 1,000,000 tons of steel to Europe in the second quarter of 1948, that steel will arrive in Europe by October, and these people are commencing to ship it back to us, to be paid for in American jobs and dollars. I hope this watchdog will be a lean and hungry hound, and not a sleek and comfortable house pet.

Mr. Speaker, the steel export quota for the second quarter of 1948 is 846,150 tons, plus tin sheet and terneplate in the amount of 125,000 tons, or a total of 971,150 tons. This is a tremendous amount and is already having a serious effect on the economy of our country.

Add to that that we are to ship in the second quarter a little less than 14,000,000 barrels of petroleum products, and it is very evident that by next winter many of our people will be suffering from cold and the high price of fuel, and these same people will, quite properly, come to their Representatives in Congress and call them to account.

Mr. Speaker, do not let us wait, as we generally do in all our foreign affairs, until the horse has left the barn before we close the door. Let us see that the law is enforced now and at all times.

Many of us were fearful that in voting for Public Law 472 we might be harming our own country, but we were assured by the authors and the protagonists of the measure that that would not be the case.

We believe that the words of section 112 of the law mean exactly what they say, and I, for one, shall constantly watch out for any violation or deviation from the policy proclaimed in this section.

HON. PAUL G. HOFFMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention that the new Chairman of the ECA, the Honorable Paul G. Hoffman, in an address before the National Association of Securities Commissioners on November 16, 1945, made the following statement—I quote:

Frequently businessmen give me a bad case of the jitters by asserting that if the shackles are taken off from free enterprise all will be well; that nothing more is needed. This comes close to being nonsense.

I have also been informed that close to a year later he said about the same thing before an American Bankers Association convention in the following words. Again I quote:

Those that claim that all we have to do is unshackle free enterprise are guilty of loose, irresponsible talk.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Appropriations Committee will question Mr. Hoffman closely concerning his belief in free enterprise. No doubt Mr. Hoffman is a man of many accomplishments, but these statements would seem to raise the question as to whether on occasion he himself is guilty of loose talk. We should find out definitely whether he believes in a free or a managed economy. During the next few years he will have the power in his hands to shape the destiny of the future world economy. Those of us who believe so strongly in free enterprise would like to have the assurance that this man is also a firm believer in a free economy. Government controls impede production and should be removed at the earliest possible moment. They are at the root of Europe's economic troubles. I trust the members of the Appropriations Committee will be able to assure us that Mr. Hoffman will work for the removal of these shackling controls which are hampering world recovery.

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 574, Rept. No. 1849), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DIRECTING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FURNISH INFORMATION TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 575, Rept. No. 1850), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 342, directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE FARMER'S FLIGHT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about inconsistencies in Government. Consistency is just as much of a jewel today as it ever was. This morning representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before our committee and urged that public funds be made available to get farmers to sow their land down to grass and get more cows. Last week the action of the House of Representatives removed the last bit of protection that the dairy industry and the good old cow had in this country. Now, 4 days later, the Department of Agriculture comes before the committee and asks for public funds to assist and encourage the development of pastures and the purchase of dairy cows in the South. Ye gods! will we not turn this thing around when we Republicans take over next year?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD and include some informational material from the Department of Agriculture.

PROPOSED COMMODITY SHIPMENTS OF ECA

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent dispatch from London indicates that a number of our British friends are disturbed about the dumping of unwanted American surpluses.

I have looked over the entire list of proposed commodity shipments of ECA and I have not been able to find a single item which could be considered in oversupply with domestic prices at the present high level. I do not know how anyone could intelligently say that we have an oversupply of any of these commodities. In fact the very opposite is true. This country today is suffering from great shortages, particularly in many of the items which we propose to ship to the participating European countries such as agricultural machines, petroleum products, freight cars, copper, newsprint, chemicals, meat, and many other things.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is the duty of the authorities at ECA and the State Department, particularly the Voice of America, to let every European know that America is not suffering from any overproduction of these vital products and that this program represents a real sacrifice on the part of American workers, as well as consumers. If the Voice of America can get this fact over, it will go a long way toward proving its value to those of us who must vote for its appropriations. So long as Europeans look upon our sacrifices as selfishness, our shipments will build hatred and discontent rather than the recovery we all desire.

LET US KEEP A SOLVENT AMERICA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about our national defense. Let me tell the membership that a solvent Government is our strongest defense. We also hear much about this country's being the richest country on the face of the earth. Assuming we are the richest country on the face of the earth, let us analyze our situation just a little.

The Treasury Department statement of April 29 shows that we are \$252,237,000,000 in debt. The President sent us a budget of \$40,000,000,000 this year, and State and local governments have a budget of about \$15,000,000,000. This makes the cost of running this country \$55,000,000,000. That is as much as our total income in 1930.

Coming before the Congress out of its committees are many bills that require

million and hundreds of millions—yes, billions of dollars. Let me tell you that if you are to have a solvent Nation you want to keep your eye on the matter of spending. It is tremendous. Study it. Some of the bills are as follows:

Public works, millions and millions.

Army and Navy public works: Army, \$207,930,350; Navy, \$130,800,000.

Military deficiency, \$500,000,000.

Air power, \$3,000,000,000.

War training, \$1,500,000,000.

Increased salaries, \$800,000,000.

Flood control, \$450,000,000.

World health, \$3,000,000.

Aid to education, \$300,000,000.

And many other bills requiring large sums of money.

I say to you to remain solvent we must stop, look, and listen.

Think, think, think, think, before you spend and spend and spend.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DR. MITCHELL FRANKLIN

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, what does it profit us if we shout down communism from our roof tops while we let our front doors open to all who would destroy that for which we stand?

If those who would destroy the policies of this Government would first confuse us, they are well on their way to success.

This Congress, on a bipartisan, non-political basis, adopted the so-called Marshall or European recovery program, whichever one you want to call it. This program was inaugurated to fight the spread of communism in western Europe.

The American people stood as a solid phalanx behind this Government in its fight against communism's attempt to take control of Italy in the recent elections. The President of the United States stood before this Congress on March 17 and asked for a selective-service law to bolster our preparedness program. On yesterday, the House Armed Services Committee, by an overwhelming vote of 28 to 5 gave to the President of the United States what he asked for. The Senate has before it a combination selective-service and universal military training program, in answer to the President's request.

These are not nebulous programs; these plans are not wishful thinking; they are a definite and positive program, forthrightly setting out the position of this Government, and its attitude toward communism, and our international policy. There can be no doubt where we stand. It is written here in bold letters, and unmistakable language. In the face

of this position, how can those of us who subscribe to this program subscribe to the appointment of individuals like Dr. Mitchell Franklin, professor of law at Tulane University in New Orleans, who, according to recent announcements, has been granted a leave of absence for the academic year of 1948-49 to serve as legal officer to the United Nations.

Who is this Dr. Mitchell Franklin, and where does he stand as related to the expressed policy of this Nation and its relation with communism and the international problems which now confront us?

Surely it is to be assumed that if Dr. Mitchell Franklin, or anybody else, is to be appointed to the legal staff of the United Nations he would subscribe to the principles for which this country stands and to its policies.

But does he?

I have outlined already here the position of this country and this Congress. Now let us see where this Dr. Mitchell Franklin stands.

On February 6 he stated this in New Orleans—and I quote:

The adventuresome Marshall plan leads straight to war. Henry Wallace's plan, together with his opposition to universal military training and to a multibillion-dollar war budget, is a plea for peace.

On March 19, after President Truman's address to this Congress, Dr. Franklin said—and I quote:

First, the message was intended to influence the impending Italian elections and to coerce the Italian people into accepting that status of an American colony by reducing their country to a base of military operations against the Soviet Union. Second, Mr. Truman's message was intended to justify an increase in the amount of military expenditures, and thus to prevent an impending American economic depression caused by the American monopolists, cartelists, and inflationists. Third, President Truman's message also was inspired by his political desperation and was an effort to restore himself as a serious candidate in the Presidential election of 1948.

How can anyone reconcile the appointment of Dr. Franklin to the United Nations in a legal capacity? No matter how inferior, subordinate, or small the job, we cannot forget that the cancer starts as a small sore on the body or that the forest-fire conflagration usually comes from a small lighted match.

Who is responsible for the appointment of this man, who certainly does not represent the policies of this administration, or this Congress, or the people of this country. How can we hope for unity and a solid front against those who would destroy us if we open small holes in the dyke through such appointments.

When I first heard of this man's appointment I asked our United Nations delegate, the hard-working, sincere Warren Austin, to let me know who was responsible for his appointment, because I knew that Senator Austin would not condone such an appointment if he was in possession of this man's record.

Today I received the following letter from Senator Austin, and I quote:

DEAR FRIEND HEBERT: As I wrote you on April 23, I had inquires made concerning Dr. Mitchell Franklin's appointment to serve as a legal officer of the United Nations.

I have just received a report in substance as follows: It appears that Dr. Franklin has been offered and accepted a temporary appointment, effective May 15, for a period of 3 months, as a legal officer with the Division for the Development and Codification of International Law in the Legal Department. Presumably the Director of the Division, Dr. Yuen-Li Liang, requested the appointment.

The Bureau of Personnel at United Nations had carefully checked Dr. Franklin's professional qualifications prior to making the appointment and I am informed that he had excellent references from the deans of several top-flight law schools in the eastern United States.

This appointment appears to have been accomplished in strict accordance with existing regulations, as prescribed by the General Assembly resolutions.

I hope that this gives you the desired information.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

I wonder who originated the appointment of this man.

I wonder in whose mind was born the idea to plant him in the United Nations circle, where he can spread his communistic venom and anti-American propaganda to the comfort and solace of the Kremlin.

If these things are to continue I wonder where do we go from here.

However, in order to be completely certain about this man's activities, I went beyond his published statements which I have just given you, and asked the Committee on Un-American Activities of this Congress to give me a full report on this man.

Here it is:

A check of the files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has shown that Mitchell Franklin, of New Orleans, La., is vice president of the National Lawyers Guild. This affiliation is revealed in a National Lawyers Guild letterhead of June 11, 1947, and in a program of a guild meeting on "Legislative Investigation?" or "Thought Control Agency?" dated October 20, 1947, page 4. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. Several prominent lawyers resigned from the organization; among them was the Honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, who wrote in his letter of resignation, June 5, 1940, that the leadership is not prepared "to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line."

Mitchell Franklin was a sponsor and a committee member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, according to an official letterhead, September 11, 1940, and a leaflet, Citizens Rally, advertising the rally in New York City on April 13, 1940, sponsored by the organization. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, the latter report describing it as a front which defended Communist teachers.

Franklin's affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties

is shown by a letterhead of November 6, 1940, and the program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, page 4, where his name appears as a sponsor. He also signed a message to the House of Representatives which was sponsored by the organization, according to an undated leaflet attached to a letterhead of the National Federation. Two separate reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities have cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as a Communist front—reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; and Attorney General Biddle said that it was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program"—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, page 7687. It has also been named subversive by Attorney General Clark, who included it in his list of such organizations which was released to the public by the Civil Service Commission on December 4, 1947.

Soviet Russia Today, June 1943, page 21, shows Mitchell Franklin as a signer of an open letter to the mayor of Stalingrad which was sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This organization was first cited as one of the principal fronts for all things Russian in the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944. Recently it was classed as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark—see press release of the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947.

The program for a dinner sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in New York City on October 27, 1943, lists Mitchell Franklin as a dinner sponsor; and a letterhead of the organization, June 19, 1942, shows that he was a sponsor of a victory fiesta held by the group. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been cited by both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities—report of March 29, 1944; and by Attorney General Clark—press release of United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947.

Other organizations with which Franklin was associated and which were cited as Communist fronts in the March 29, 1944, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities are: American Council on Soviet Relations, the American Committee to Save Refugees, the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, and the National Emergency Conference. An official letterhead of the American Council on Soviet Relations shows Mitchell Franklin as a signer of an open letter to the President of the United States urging declaration of war on Finland. The leaflet, For the Rescue of Refugees, issued by the American Committee to Save Refugees listed him as a sponsor. He is revealed as one of the committee members and sponsors of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges by its letterhead of September 11, 1941. The letterhead of the National Emergency Conference, dated May 19, 1939, lists him as a sponsor.

An article by Mitchell Franklin appeared in the Communist-front publication, *Soviet Russia Today*, January 1943, page 21. The publication was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in two separate reports, dated June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944.

The Communist Party's organ, the *Daily Worker*, has contained the name of Prof. Mitchell Franklin in several recent issues, mentioning him as chairman of the Louisiana Wallace for President Committee—see the *Worker*, February 15, 1948, page 2; *Daily Worker*, February 25, 1948, page 7; the *Worker*, February 29, 1948, page 2; and April 4, 1948, page 2.

Perhaps many of you never heard the name of Mitchell Franklin until I called it on the floor of this House today.

Nobody ever heard of Corp. Adolf Schicklgruber, in World War I either, nor the remote newspaper scribbler named Mussolini, until it was all too late.

Not that this man would ever become a Hitler or a Mussolini, but it is just an example of how those to whom we pay the least attention sometimes cause the most trouble.

It seems to me that it is about time we gird ourselves for the fight against communism from within, before we attempt to blot it out from abroad.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Was Dr. Franklin appointed by the Supreme Court?

Mr. HEBERT. The gentleman would have more information on that than I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and to include an editorial from the *Atlanta Constitution* of May 3.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* on the subject of Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and include an excellent editorial appearing in the *Santa Fe New Mexican* on February 28.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and include an article.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and include two reports.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the *Record* and include an editorial from the *Beaver Dam Daily Citizen*.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *Record* and include a newspaper article written by Walter Thoran.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *Record*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a fateful year for the American people. They have given much in toil and treasure, plus blood and tears, to achieve peace. At the close of the shooting period of the late war, mankind looked hopefully toward the dawn to discern if enduring peace had come at last.

The United Nations, upon which we have placed our hopes for a just and lasting peace, is now beset with growing pains and is as yet only partially effective. It is a young organization, but, even so, it is our hope for peace in the world. We insisted on a veto when we went into the United Nations organization. We wanted it to use to veto war. Russia wanted the veto also before she would join. To our chagrin and dismay, she has used the veto 23 times so far to veto the peace.

We, in the United States, have done everything we know, almost even to appeasement, to let Russia know that we want peace above everything else in the world; that we want her to enter the family of nations in the spirit of co-operation and good will, so there will be no more war. We had hoped that she would do that. Lately we have come to the very definite conclusion that she is determined to impose her ideas of government upon the rest of the world, if she can. To meet that challenge, good intentions on our part are not enough. We have decided that we must implement our good intentions with proper action. We have established, therefore, two major programs, and I may say that each of these programs is a bipartisan program supported by both the Republican and Democratic leaders.

One of these is what is known as the Marshall plan. This plan is based upon the idea that we will not give relief any further but that the countries in western Europe and in China must help themselves. When they determine to do that, then we are to step in and help them to get their farms and their factories and their businesses back on their feet. This is one of the greatest movements for peace ever undertaken by mankind. It certainly is the first time the United States has undertaken so great a program for peace. If the Marshall plan is carried out to its ultimate conclusion, the cost to the people of the United States for a 4-year period will be in the neighborhood of \$17,000,000,000. This vast sum of money is almost beyond our imagination. Yet it amounts to only a small fraction of the \$300,000,000,000 we poured into war.

If our venture in this direction succeeds in bolstering the hope of the peoples in western Europe and Asia and encourages them to keep their freedom, then we will have established a bulwark against communism which will stand us in good stead in the years ahead while we labor to strengthen the United Nations so that it can keep the peace for which we strive.

Already, we see the fruits of this program beginning to show. Recently, the Italian people, encouraged by our program, have slapped communism back and we have every reason to believe that western Europe will be saved.

If this can be done, it will help us through trade to recover the amount of money which we are now spending through the Marshall plan to encourage these nations to help themselves. Not only will it help our farmers, our merchants, our laboring people, but it will help our business people move the goods that are so vital to good business.

Another result for good appears now to be taking form and that is the organization of the western European countries into a bloc of states friendly to our form of government, who will, if war should come again, be on our side and give us a landing spot to fight on foreign soil rather than forcing us to defend on our home ground. God forbid that we ever have another war. The American people are instinctively for peace. As a Nation, we are unselfish and are as willing to sacrifice for peace as we always have been willing to sacrifice to win a war.

The other of our programs for peace is the strengthening of our defenses. The best insurance against war is our own strength. We must stay strong.

As for my own part in the difficult days that lie ahead of us, I want, with Judge Almond, of Roanoke, to quote the following from the King's Message:

And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown."

And he replied: "Go out into the darkness and put thine hand into the hand of God. That shall be to thee better than light and safer than a known way."

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there must have been a celebration in Moscow last night; for the Communists won their greatest victory in the Supreme Court of the United States on yesterday, when that once august body proceeded to destroy the value of property owned by tens of thousands of loyal Americans in every State in the Union by their anti-covenants decision.

Thomas Jefferson, the wisest political philosopher of all time, once said that if this Republic is ever destroyed it will be destroyed by the courts.

That day seems to have arrived.

That tribunal recently upheld the atheists in outlawing religious exercises in our public schools.

I seriously doubt if it would be legal under that decision to repeat the Lord's Prayer or to read a passage from Holy Writ in any public school in America.

The members of that tribunal recently attempted, by judicial fiat, to redraw the boundary lines of every State that happens to border on the ocean, the Gulf, or the Great Lakes. They attempted to justify their decision by the cry of "Oil"—which was one of the least things involved.

They now attempt to reverse the laws of nature by their own edict and destroy the peaceful relationships existing between different races in every State by outlawing the restrictive covenants that have existed for more than 100 years.

Which all adds up to the fact that white Christian Americans seem to have no rights left which the present Supreme Court feels bound to respect.

Unless the Congress comes to the relief of the American people in these critical hours and turns back this tide of fanaticism, then God save the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just want to say that the Supreme Court decision of yesterday did more to bring about a revival of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States than anything else that has been done in the last 40 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ECA

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I propose to give to the House specific information as to the ECA program as it is unfolding in hearings that have been conducted now for several weeks before the Deficiency Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. The Congress, in my opinion, is entitled to the information as the information becomes available.

Point No. 1: The country has been aroused, and Members of Congress have repeatedly referred to the fact that the ECA program contemplates the gift or grant to Portugal and Switzerland of large sums of money.

I may say that is a complete misstatement of fact and that there is no fund provided for either Switzerland or Portugal in the proposals that will shortly be brought before the Congress.

Point No. 2: The price of meat in America is in some quarters charged to the fact that the ECA program proposes to drain off the markets of American meat that is needed by local consumers.

There is not one pound of meat involved in the ECA program that has been submitted to the committee except some horse meat.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extrane-

ous material. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD, and will cost \$301.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excellent article appearing in the Washington Star of last night by Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, and also an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of May 2.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs began hearings this morning on the whole question of what to do about the United Nations, how to strengthen it, if possible, so that it can become a genuinely effective instrument for peace and against aggression and thus able to do what most of the people of the world want it to do and what obviously, in its present form, it cannot do or is not being permitted to do.

Tomorrow Secretary Marshall is to testify in the morning and the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Austin, is to testify in the afternoon.

The following day there will be opportunity for Members of the House and Senate to testify. The committee will be happy to hear any Member who cares to make a statement or to file a statement of his views on whether we ought to go ahead with the United Nations as it is, or try to strengthen it, modify it, correct it, so that it can function to stay the present rapid deterioration in international relations.

JESSE L. PURDY

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "\$55.47" and insert "\$41.12."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co., with

Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "for", insert "payment made in settlement and satisfaction of liability to which said Mississippi Central Railroad Co. was subjected by."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEMPSTEAD WAREHOUSE CORP.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., a New York corporation, against the United States for loss or damage sustained by it as owner of land adjacent to Mitchel Field, in Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the extension and enlargement of Mitchel Field and any plans preparatory thereto and any use of said land in connection with the construction, use, and operation of said airfield as extended and enlarged, including but not limited to the temporary possession and use of the land by the United States under an order for immediate possession made by the United States district court for the eastern district of New York on the 30th day of June 1942. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIZZIE REYNOLDS

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MOSE ALTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1801) for the relief of Mose Altman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS and Mr. DOLLIVER objected.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected.

ANNA PECHNIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anna Pechnik, of Los Angeles, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last actual entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the attorney general is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, and bond issued in the case of Anna Pechnik, of Los Angeles, Calif. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Anna Pechnik shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such warrant and order have issued.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland for the year then current or the next following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. JOHN H. MOTT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 182) for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. John H. Mott, of Denver, Colo., the sum of \$83, in full satisfaction of this claim against the United

States for refund of a forfeiture of pay which was imposed upon him on November 11, 1944, by the commanding general, Second Air Force, who subsequently determined that he had erroneously punished the said John H. Mott: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN C. RODGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 576) for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan C. Rodgers, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of \$213.12, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damage to his automobile which occurred when a United States Navy airplane crashed near his residence in Coquille, Oreg., on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL W. SUNDBROM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 981) for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$92 to Carl W. Sundstrom, on account of money taken from his person and destroyed by prisoners on or about the 2d day of May 1946, during a riot at the United States penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS D. CHRISMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman,

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris D. Chrisman, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding collided with a United States Army vehicle, on United States Highway No. 1, 3 miles south of Oak Hill, Fla., on November 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS L. WILLIAMS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1630) for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Louis L. Williams, Jr., of the Public Health Service, is hereby relieved of all liability, both as to principal and interest, under the claim of the United States arising out of the reimbursement to him of the sum of \$560.16 from the appropriation "Preventing the Spread of Epidemic Diseases, Public Health Service, 1940," for payment made by him in December 1939 for one Ford coupe automobile purchased in Kunming, China, and for various items incident to repair, maintenance, and operation of the automobile; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis L. Williams, Jr., an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by Louis L. Williams, Jr., or which may have been withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in partial satisfaction of such claim. In the settlement of the accounts of Louis L. Williams, Jr., as a disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given him for such sum of \$560.16.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSIGN MERTON H. PETERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1806) for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$197.43, to Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him while hospitalized in Sioux Valley Hospital, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as a result of having been

stricken with appendicitis on January 1, 1946, while on leave from the United States naval service: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS D. SHOEMAKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1875) for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. P. S. Newman and Richard J. Taggart, as executors of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker, the sum of \$54.49, which sum was awarded to Francis D. Shoemaker by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on December 24, 1925, as compensation for land condemned for streets in the District of Columbia and was paid into the court but was returned, under the rules of the court, to the United States Treasury when it was not claimed, the said Francis D. Shoemaker having died before collecting the sum: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MYRTLE HOVDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Myrtle Hovde, Westby, Wis., the sum of \$420. Such sum is equal to the compensation which the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde would have received for the year 1945 pursuant to the act entitled "An act to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the world war," approved June 28, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 38, sec. 503, and the following), if her annual income for such year had not been in excess of \$1,000. After the death on July 3, 1944, of her husband, Joseph B. Hovde, a World War I veteran and an employee of the Post Office Department, the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde made immediate application to the United States Civil Service Commission for the amount of \$1,993.30 standing to the credit of the said Joseph B.

Hovde in the civil-service retirement and disability fund. Due to the delay of the Commission, the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde did not receive such amount until January 15, 1945, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs denied payment of compensation to the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde for the year 1945 on the ground that such amount constituted annual income for such year in excess of \$1,000. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy, the sum of \$1,100. The payment of such sum is to assist in repairing Confederate memorial monument in Tampa, Fla., which was damaged under date of October 27, 1946, by an accident caused by certain men of the United States Navy, and the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy, against the United States on account of property damages to the Confederate memorial monument in Court House Square, Lafayette and Franklin Streets, Tampa, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,100" and insert "\$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA C. NETZLEY RIDLEY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2688) for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva C. Netzley Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of \$1,000; to the administrator of the estate of Clyde C. Netzley, deceased, late of Naperville, Ill., the sum of \$5,000; to William G. Stuff, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of \$1,000; to William G. Stuff, as administrator of the estate of Sarah C. Stuff, deceased, late of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of \$2,000; to Lois Stuff, nee Greenawalt, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of \$3,500; and to Harry E. Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of \$168.85; in all, \$12,668.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, death, and property damage sustained in a collision with a National Park Service truck, operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on August 24, 1935, at the intersection of Thirty-first Street with Illinois State Highway No. 54, near Hinsdale, Du Page County, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HAMPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3984) for the relief of George Hampton.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP., OF NOANK, CONN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn., the following sums: (1) \$2,100, representing liquidated damages withheld by the Government under a contract numbered W-51, qm-412, entered into by said corporation with the War Department for repairs to the United States steamer *Colonel Barnett*; and (2) \$4,518.74, representing payment for additional repairs which said corporation was required to make upon said steamer and which were not specified by said contract. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of said corporation against the United States arising out of said contracts or in connection with the repairs made on said vessel: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WOOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of Edward Woolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Woolf, Boston, Mass., the sum of \$1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward Woolf against the United States arising out of his being struck, on November 9, 1943, on Brattle Street in Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1943" and insert "1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 810) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John E. Parker, of Hilton Village, Va., his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States for alleged damages caused by the alleged wrongful allowance by the United States Army authorities in charge of Camp Patrick Henry, Va., of the flow of sewage from said camp over and across certain oyster grounds, situated in the Warwick River, in Warwick County, Va., which grounds had been leased by the said John E. Parker.

Sec. 2. Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST L. GODFREY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest L. Godfrey, one-quarter degree Klamath Indian, the sum of \$2,500. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from injury to his right arm on October 26, 1926, which was caught in the mangle of the laundry on the Hoopa Indian school grounds, California, during a period when he was a student in the school and was assigned to duty in the laundry in part compensation toward his tuition: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "October 26" and insert "November 13."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "and was assigned to duty in the laundry in part compensation toward his tuition."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSELLA M. KOSTENBADER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader, 235 West Homer Street, Freeport, Ill., the sum of \$37.64, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Freeport, Ill., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by Members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. LAWSON AND FIREMAN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to Carl E. Lawson, of San Mateo, Calif., and to pay the sum of \$1,038.79 to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses sustained by Carl E. Lawson, and for reimbursement to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., for expenditures as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on a pier on the water front, San Francisco, Calif., on September 30, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such payment only after the receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the judgment in the sum of \$5,000 entered by the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., in case No. 322,295, minute book 671, page 403, in favor of Carl E. Lawson and against Joseph A. Rice, has been satisfied and discharged of record: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS MARIE RICHARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2898) for the relief of Doris Marie Richard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris Marie Richard, of Dorchester, Mass., the sum of \$1,156.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by her and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Beach Street and Billings Road, in Quincy, Mass., on June 10, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,156.50" and insert "\$904."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2325) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765-770), the Bureau of Employees Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Mamie L. Hurley for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of the death of her husband, Edwin L. Hurley, deceased, whose death on March 21, 1945, is alleged to have been the result of injuries, with consequent disability, received in August 1940, in the performance of his duty as a machinist in the Veterans' Administration at Kecoughtan, Va.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for or against payment of compensation provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESTER L. ELDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of Lester L. Elder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Lester L. Elder, Rocky Comfort, Mo., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the accident which occurred approximately 16 miles east of Wells, Nev., on United States Highway No. 40 on January 21, 1946, when the automobile in which the said Lester L. Elder and certain members of his family were traveling was struck by an Army vehicle being operated by an Army officer acting outside the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof: "to Lester L. Elder and Esther E. Elder, husband and wife, of Rocky Comfort, Mo., the sum of \$1,183.49, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages and personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by them and their two minor daughters, Donna Lee Elder and Evelyn Mae Elder, as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, which occurred on United States Highway No. 40, about 16 miles east of Wells, Nev., on January 21, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Ester E. Elder."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LUCILLE DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,075.40 to Mrs. Lucille Davidson, Morrison, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, which occurred on March 14, 1944, in Newport News, Va.:

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the word "for", strike out "property damage" and insert in lieu thereof "personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred."

At the end of bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS KRANEY AND CLARE FELTEN
KRANEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6251) for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the restrictions on the issuance of visas in Germany pursuant to the President's directive of December 22, 1945, the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to instruct the American consul at Frankfurt, Germany, to consider applications for immigration visas filed by Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney now residing in Frankfurt, Germany.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Harry Tansey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar. AMENDING SECTION 13 OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, when the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, was called objection was made to its consideration. That objection has been withdrawn. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (55 Stat. 756), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any disposal agency designated pursuant to this act may, with the approval of the Administrator, convey to any State, political subdivision, instrumentalities thereof, or municipality, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus land, including improvements and equipment located thereon, which, in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior, is suitable and desirable for use as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument, for the benefit of the public. The Administrator, from funds appropriated to the War Assets Administration, shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for the costs incurred in making any such determination.

"(2) Conveyances for park or recreational purposes made pursuant to the authority contained in this subsection shall be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal, regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Administrator. Conveyances of property for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration.

"(3) The deed of conveyance of any surplus real property disposed of under the provisions of this subsection—

"(A) shall provide that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purpose for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event that such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purpose during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and

"(B) may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 13 (f) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except (1) transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of this act, as amended; (2) disposals to veterans under section 16 of this act, as amended; and (3) purchases made under section 208 (a) of their joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,' approved June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 202). Disposals of real property to States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof for any of the purposes specified in section 13 (a) (1) (A), section 13 (a) (1) (B), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 13 (e), section 13 (g), or section 13 (h) of such act, as amended, shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of this act, as amended. The Administrator may prescribe a reasonable time during which any such priority shall be exercised."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 208 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," approved June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 202), is amended to read as follows: "The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following (a) transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended; (b) disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended; and (c) disposals of property to States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof under section 13 (a) (1) (A), section 13 (a) (1) (B), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 13 (e), section 13 (g), or section 13 (h) of such act, as amended."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "55" and insert "58"; and after the word "Stat.", strike out "756" and insert "770."

On page 2, line 20, insert "Provided, That, in determining the status of property as historic-monument character, due consideration shall be given to the period of time during which the United States has enjoyed continuous ownership."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: To amend the title of the act by inserting the words italicized: "To amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposi-

tion of surplus property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use in connection with any of their governmental functions, and for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 2, line 6, after the word "desirable", insert the following: "for use in connection with any of its governmental functions or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 2, line 12, after the word "for", insert the following: "use in connection with a governmental function or for."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, these amendments that have just been agreed to have been suggested by the Federal Works Administration, which have to do with the administration of the provisions of this bill. I know of no objection to it. The purpose is to correct an earlier condition and make it possible for a municipality to secure a piece of the property under discussion, thus wiping out a question in the minds of the War Assets Administration.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 2, line 4, after the word "land", insert "not to exceed 500 acres."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered requires no explanation. It limits the amount of land that can be turned over to 500 acres. All of the projects contemplated under this act are of acreage considerably less than 500. Therefore, the adoption of this amendment would not in any wise affect the purposes that were in the minds of the committee at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman some instance in mind where the 500-acre limitation would apply?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I have in mind the military reservation in Pennsylvania, a reservation of approximately 20,000 acres which includes practically an entire township. If that tract is turned over to a State for recreational purposes, it will mean that the township will be bankrupt, and there will be no way at all to get any revenue except through the taxes that come from this property when it is in private hands. It is a very valuable tract and ought not to be given away.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RAMEY) may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, both having to do with radio broadcasts, one from Boston, Mass., on May 1, over the Worldwide Broadcasting Foundation to the citizens of Poland, and in the second instance to include a statement by him over radio station WHDH in Boston to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

KENNEWICK DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 550 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 4954, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Under this bill the Kennewick division of the Yakima project in Washington would be extended to provide irrigation of an additional 16,700 acres. The project would also include a small hydroelectric power development with a capacity of about 12,000 kilowatts.

It has been estimated that the additional land which would be irrigated under the provisions of this bill will produce \$2,000,000 in foodstuffs yearly. The land is now arid, and has little value. The increased value resulting from irrigation will also increase tax payments to the local, State, and Federal Governments.

The estimated cost of the project is \$10,736,000, of which \$10,030,000 is reimbursable. The other \$705,000, which is

not reimbursable, will be allocated to fish and wildlife preservation. But even this \$705,000 will eventually be repaid out of tax payments on the improved land.

The proposed project is contiguous to the Hanford Engineer Works, which is operated by the Atomic Energy Commission. The condemnation of land for this atomic energy project took about 7,000 acres out of food production. This caused a 50-percent reduction in the supply of asparagus and soft fruits available for processors and shippers in the town of Kennewick. Therefore this legislation is urgent to restore the economy of Kennewick and to provide electricity for the increasing population of the surrounding area.

This rule provides 1 hour of general debate on the bill but it does not alter any of the other rules of the House governing procedure during consideration of a bill of this character. There is nothing in the rule which could possibly be objectionable to any Member of the House, and I urge that you all vote for its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], has explained the purpose of the bill made in order by this rule. Having voted during all my service in this House for reclamation and irrigation projects, naturally I am not opposed to this proposed legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that in past years the repayments provided for have not been made, nor was the interest paid. Of course, the conditions prevailing at that time made it impossible practically for those who lived on irrigated land and reclamation lands to obtain sufficient prices to meet their obligations under the legislation previously passed. But conditions have changed. Today the people who will derive the benefits from these 16,000 acres of land, which I consider of extremely high value, are able to pay. After this bill goes into effect land which formerly was worth \$2 to \$3 an acre will be worth \$200 to \$300 an acre. I do not see any reason why we should grant the extremely long, additional time for repayment as provided in this bill. Originally the bill provided 60 years for repayment, most of it without interest to the Government.

I feel that the Government, which will expend this large sum of money, over \$10,000,000, should receive interest, especially in view of the tremendous increase in the value of the property to the owners of that property and the benefits they will receive.

As I said previously, in years gone by this long time has been granted, but I do not think that is necessary today in view of the high prices that the farmers obtain for all their crops. In fact, when this project is completed by the men owning this land, they will be able or should be able to repay to the Government within 10 years, not 66 years, and should pay interest on that money in view of the great benefits that will accrue to them. Of course, there was

a justification on the part of the Congress to be liberal in connection with these irrigation and reclamation projects in past years. I voted to extend the time on many of these projects and also voted to waive payment of interest. But at this time as I have stated, when prices are high I feel that the time should be reduced. I repeat it should be repaid in 10 years and with interest.

With the prices that the farmers today are obtaining I think it would be possible for them to do that under this bill. In former years when I voted for these extensions and the long time for repayment, the farmers were getting about a quarter or not even a quarter of what they are receiving today for the crops that they raised.

I recollect in 1930, 1931, and 1932 the price of wheat, corn, and rye was about one-tenth of what those commodities bring today. At that time the prices were 16 cents, 26 cents, and 32 cents a bushel, approximately. Cattle and hogs were bringing to the farmers about 3 to 3½ cents a pound on the hoof. Today they are receiving from \$26 to \$36 a hundred for their stock when it is brought to the market.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the great prosperity that the farmers have enjoyed I feel that should be taken into consideration and that the Government and the administration that have made this possible, especially in the last 14 or 15 years, should be fairly treated.

I know that the farmers in proportion to their earnings and their profits pay much less income tax than any other group of people. They have all the advantages, but they do not seem to appreciate those who made that possible for them. I feel that if they will take time and give it real consideration instead of assailing and attacking the New Deal, they will offer prayers that there was such a thing as the New Deal that made it possible for them to eliminate their mortgages, rebuild their farms, restock and increase their herds, and derive the great profits which are theirs. I do not envy them the prosperity, and the chances are that in proportion they are not making, perhaps, any more money on their investments than some of the corporations that were mentioned by the agricultural gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday. I realize that many of these industrial organizations are making the American people and making profits up to 100, 150, and 200 percent above what they made in former years, but notwithstanding that fact they have failed to and refused to increase the meager salaries or wages of their employees, notwithstanding the accumulated profits and benefits that have accrued to them. Consequently they are responsible for the strikes that are facing us now. In my home city today there is a strike in the stockyards. I have evidence and you have evidence showing how much the big four packers have made. Their net income for 1946 was \$63,000,000 and jumped to \$87,000,000 in 1947. Yet in the face of these huge profits and which they are making today, they maintain that they cannot increase the low wages of their employees. With the prevailing

high prices for which the packers and many other of these industrialists are responsible, the employees and their families cannot live decently and are in debt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, since he has been talking about the farmer, for yielding to one. Does the gentleman think that the administration has contributed one advantage toward our farm prosperity by legislation, or was it caused more by the fact that we got into a war? Was it the New Deal that made us farmers economic royalists so that we could pay all these big income taxes? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. SABATH. Long before the war, and ever since the election of Roosevelt as President, and ever since the Democratic Party came into power in 1933, the prices of farm products started to rise. I have given you the prices that the farmers received in 1930, 1931, and 1932, and how they were losing their farms during the Hoover administration and were obliged to pay 6 and 8 percent interest on the money which they owed. Now, since the Roosevelt administration, most of these mortgages have been repaid and in addition to that money has been accumulated by the vast majority of the good farmers of this land. I will say this, that not only since the war, but the gentleman knows that prices started to rise in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937, and prices have gone up continuously, because it was the aim of the New Deal to help the farmers and assist the farmers. At the same time the administration has believed and hoped, and I, as one, believe that the laboring people who aided the farmers to produce these big crops, who made the big profits possible, will also join with me and others to aid the unfortunate wage earner who is unable today to cope with the conditions that face him due to the extremely criminal high prices of the necessities of life. Now, that is what I demand. You do not realize what the people of the large cities are subjected to.

I answered the gentleman, did I not?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I have another question.

Mr. SABATH. I shall implement those figures and make it clear for your own satisfaction, and then I know you, too, will come to the conclusion that a great deal has been done for the farmers and for the country, because under the New Deal we prospered as never before.

We are a greater and richer nation than any other in the world, and I hope we will continue to be so. The only thing I am pleading for is that the wage earner be taken into consideration, especially when all the industries are making such tremendous profits. The wage earner should be able to exist and provide decently for himself and his family. That is my contention.

I have said all I desire to say on this subject. I have voted for these reclamation and irrigation projects for 42 years, and shall continue to vote for them if it will help the people, will help to produce

additional crops, and will increase the wealth of our Nation and produce more food.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] assailed the Supreme Court because of the ruling it made. Personally, I am of the opinion that Chief Justice Vinson, who has been a Member of this House and has held many important positions, is an outstanding American who has the interest of America at heart. What applies to him applies to other Justices of the Supreme Court. I think when they have rendered an important decision depriving individuals of the right to do what the Government itself cannot do, they deserve credit, and ought not to be criticized by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HORAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1851), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1949 it may be in order to consider without intervention of a point of order a section which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided herein, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this act shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing Officer without countersignature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

TERM OF ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record on a joint resolution I have just introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution pro-

posing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would extend the terms of election of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years.

There have been various proposals over the period of years to adjust the term of years for Members of the House and this is not a new thought. However, I believe this proposal should have more general approval and support by the Congress and the people throughout the country.

It not only provides that the term of the Members of the House shall be 4 years, but it also provides that the Members shall be elected at the same time of the election of President.

In other words, this provides, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House and the President of the United States, shall be elected for the period of 4 years.

Furthermore, I propose that a Member of the House shall not be eligible to become a candidate for Senator during the term of his House membership unless he resigns from the House. This would avoid the general contention that a Member of the House would take advantage of the off year to run for the Senate. I have given much thought and study to this practical problem and I believe the proposal is thoroughly justified to resolve this difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied the history of this provision of the Constitution. I am convinced that in view of conditions existing in these modern days that this proposal would be for the best interest of our country. Travel and communications as well as the vast improvement of the press and radio makes our present-day approach to elections and services in the Congress so much different than it was in the early history of our country.

The public would be better served by the adoption of such an amendment. First, for the reason that the election to a 4-year term of office will be likely to attract to or retain in the Congress men of greater ability than does the present 2-year term.

Second, that a substantial part of the time of a Member of Congress under the 2-year-term basis necessarily is taken up in building up the fences for reelection at the end of 2 years and a 4-year term would relieve him of this recurring 2-year period, thus enabling him to devote a greater part of his time to the problems of his district and the country.

Third, it would be a long step in the direction in recognizing intelligence and statesmanship over financial ability in the election of Members of the House.

The activities of the Federal Government have expanded to such an extent within the last 10 or 12 years that it is practically impossible for any Member of Congress to get an intelligent grasp of the scope of problems that arise in the functioning of the Government in a 2-year period. If a Member is elected only for 2 years, his time and the taxpayer's money have not made any great contribution to the welfare of the country.

This would give a greater opportunity for a Member of the House to render more valuable service to his country. It would give greater opportunity for more study and consideration of the vast num-

ber and tremendous problems so vitally affecting our people.

There are some who think otherwise but I am convinced from past experience and even during the Eightieth Congress that it would be a wiser policy to have the Congress and the Executive of the same party. This would produce this desired result except in extreme and extraordinary circumstances.

I ask attention of each Member of the House to this proposal.

KENNEWICK DIVISION OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4954, with Mr. BREHM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H. R. 4954, was carefully considered by the subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands and again considered by the full Committee on Public Lands, where it was explained in every possible detail by its author, the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] to whom I now yield as much time as he desires.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, the construction of this division of the Yakima project would provide for the bringing into cultivation of 16,700 acres of dry arid land, and supplemental water to 4,300 acres already under irrigation. The development of the project is urgently needed. Construction during the war of the Hanford Engineer Works, a large plutonium plant only a few miles from the Kennewick division, took out of production about 7,000 acres of irrigated land, which in turn reduced the supply of agricultural produce to processors, shippers, and consumers in this area by approximately 50 percent. Similarly the McNary Dam, now under construction by the Corps of Engineers on the Columbia River will reduce the farm lands contributing to the Kennewick market by an additional thousand acres. The construction of the project would serve not only to counteract these reductions in farm areas, but would at the same time supply additional food crops to help meet the demands placed upon local food supplies by reason of the increase in industrial population in the area.

Since 1940 our national population has increased 10 percent, and the increase in the far West is approximately 40 percent. The number of families has increased 13½ percent Nation-wide, and in the 8 years we have had 14,000,000 people or more than the total population of Canada. Every month the increase in the population in this country is equal to the addition of a city of approximately 200,000 people. The increase in population has caused a steady expansion of markets and it is becoming increasingly more difficult to feed our people. In the past few years, several millions of people have moved from rural to metropolitan areas. These facts combined with the international food problem mean just one thing—more food. One of the greatest migrations of population in the history of this country has been during the war years to the Pacific coast. The State of Washington is holding its increase. In other words, we have a great and permanent increase. New lands available are in the West. They must have water to give them life. One of the most valuable commodities on the face of the earth is water on the arid lands of the West. I do not think it is necessary here to take additional time to explain in detail the features of the program. They were fully covered by the chairman of the Committee on Rules when he was presenting the rule.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. Can the gentleman advise us if he knows how Mr. Robert Lucas one of the most outstanding editors in the Pacific Northwest and now editor of two Yakima newspapers, stands on this particular project?

Mr. HOLMES. He is very enthusiastically for it, and has been a strong supporter of this project.

Mr. NORBLAD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have not had a chance to read the bill carefully, but does it provide for the building of necessary transmission lines?

Mr. HOLMES. There are no transmission lines. They handle most of the power on the project itself. If any transmission lines are needed, they will be built.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What is the life of the project as far as the retirement of the loan is concerned?

Mr. HOLMES. Forty years for the water users, plus a 10-year construction period, and 66 years in relation to power, at 2½ percent interest.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The local interests agree under the terms of the bill, as I read the report of the committee, that \$10,031,000 is reimbursable of the total \$10,736,000 total cost; is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And that \$705,000 allotted to fish and wildlife preservation is for the general benefit of the whole Nation.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It therefore will cost the Nation as a whole practically nothing and it will be of great benefit to the western arid lands in the State of Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that the original bill called for an amortization period of 78 years. The committee has cut it down to 66. I remember that last January the committee reported out a bill covering all reclamation projects and extending the amortization period from 50 years to 66 or 68, I forget which.

Mr. HOLMES. There are some precedents.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am for this. The gentleman does not have to worry about me, I am worrying about his Republican colleagues, that is all I am worrying about.

Mr. HOLMES. There is one project in Colorado which is to be amortized over a 68-year period and the Gila project in Arizona over a 60-year period.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was the bill of last January which passed the House and when it passed the Congress and is signed will become organic law.

Mr. HOLMES. It passed the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. But as I understand existing practice the amortization period is 50 years.

Mr. HOLMES. That is true, but it is not the law of the land. I think it has not passed the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the amortization period under existing law?

Mr. HOLMES. It varies with the feasibility report on the project as drawn up by the engineers and the estimated ability of the project.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman himself believe there ought to be at least a 66-year period of amortization?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; I should like to see that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know about this project; it is a very fine one. It is of great benefit not only to the State of Washington, but it is of national interest and importance.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I view these things from a national angle, and I am frank in stating that I am very glad to see this extended period of amortization; as a matter of fact, 78 years would have been all right with me because there are real sound investments; they are not investments for a generation, they are investments for many generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Washington five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The pending bill provides:

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for the sale of electric power and energy not required for project uses, hereinafter termed commercial power and energy, at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales of power and energy, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements—

And so forth. If we are going to leave it to the secretary of the interior to establish the rate structure it had better not be on the formula used in TVA, where they do not take into consideration the cost and the money that the Government has invested in the project plus interest on the money and overhead cost. On that basis we would not get enough money in 65 years to cover any part of the cost.

In the TVA project the electric-power part of it is being operated by the Federal Government at a loss of millions of dollars annually. If all these power projects are going to be operated on the same basis, then we had better quit. It is not even as good as a socialistic form of government when you try to do things that way.

Why do we not get a little business into government and change the base of the rate structure at TVA so that we get a proper return? Why do we not start out on a proper base in this project?

Mr. HOLMES. I can assure the gentleman that the engineering report on this project shows that these rates will pay the money back plus 2½ percent interest. We were very careful in seeing to it that it was drawn up in that way. I was careful in seeing that it was drawn up in that way.

Mr. RICH. We are going to hear something about this bill and some comment on TVA rates. Some people in this House would stand up and try to defend those rates, but there is no defense for TVA rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania shadow-boxed around until he almost knocked himself out before he quit.

The truth of the matter is that 20 years ago his administration was in power. They were selling the power generated at Muscle Shoals to private power companies at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale and proved to Congress that the project would be amortized within a reasonable time. Today, we are paying about 4½ mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for that power. We are paying more than twice as much as the private power companies did at that time and we are willing to do it.

Mr. RICH. Who do you mean by "we"?

Mr. RANKIN. We are amortizing the entire investment.

Mr. RICH. Who do you mean by "we"?

Mr. RANKIN. We, the people who are buying this power. I am one of them. Look at me.

Mr. RICH. Yes; but we are the people who are furnishing the money and we want to know if you are going to pay at least the principal back.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not cost the State of Pennsylvania a penny, it will not cost the gentleman from Woolrich [Mr. RICH] a penny. That great project down there, the greatest development in ancient or modern times, is amortizing itself just as this project will, according to the presentation of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I can assure the Members from the long experience I have had with irrigation and reclamation that it is not wise to bring anything before the House unless it is sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was unanimously reported out of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and, as I remember, it was unanimously reported out of the full Public Lands Committee. I want to go on record, first, without reservation as favoring this bill, and, having said that, I want to refer to a matter raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

He noted that the committee amendment reduces the repayment time from 78 years to 66 years. Yes; that was a committee amendment. I was not too enthusiastic about the amendment, however, because I did not think it was necessary. But when I saw that the committee intended to pass the amendment, I wanted the bill to be reported unanimously, so raised no question about it. May I say to the gentleman from Washington, author of the bill, that, so far as I am concerned, I should have preferred that it remain as it was originally written.

The gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out that we western people, in our struggle to develop our part of the country as it ought to be developed, have run into some pretty serious difficulties. When we want to make improvements upon land, which improvements will stand for generations, the costs of which are reimbursable, every cent of which is repaid to the Public Treasury, we are often told that we must repay it in 40 years or we will not get the money. A foolish and restrictive financial policy is put forth in the name of good business.

Not long ago I stood at Hoover Dam on the occasion of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of its production of power and I was told by the engineers in charge of Hoover Dam that in 10 years, through the sale of power, it had paid 25 percent of its cost. Certainly Hoover Dam will pay out in 40 years. But will Hoover Dam be no good after 40 years? I see no reason why Hoover Dam should not be functioning 400 years from now just as it is today, if you can keep the mud out and the maintenance up. The power demand is there, and it will be creating wealth centuries hence.

Mr. Chairman, when we make investments of that sort in concrete form, in revenue-producing wealth that will stand for generations and generations, we are accomplishing something of increasing value. Mind you, Uncle Sam will get back every penny in repayment that he puts into these projects. In some cases he is getting it back with interest. He is getting back the capital investment many times over in income taxes from them. His equity in the matter is improving year by year as these installment payments are made, so that the debt is more secure and the significance of these wealth-creating projects to the United States Treasury grows with each passing year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me folly that when we develop that great landed estate of Uncle Sam west of the Mississippi River, we should be so picayunish about our appropriations and about repayment terms, and that some among us insist on squeezing to the last degree these repayments so that they must be made absolutely in a shortened period. Such a policy cramps rather than promotes such development.

I certainly agree with my friend from Massachusetts that we have much to hope for; that you will not only enact this bill, but that you will follow the philosophy that the committee has followed in reporting bills on other reclamation projects throughout the 17 Western States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to know if the gentleman has in mind any period of time that he thinks is reasonable for any large advance of money by the Federal Government to be retired for the cost of a project. If there is no period of time, that means that the Federal Government is financing the whole project without any possibility of return, or when the return comes, it is so late that it is of no value to the people as a whole.

Mr. MURDOCK. Repayments are made on an annual basis, varying according to the years of the repayment period.

For my own part, I have confidence in the Secretary of the Interior. I have seen a lack of confidence expressed on the floor of this House many times. It does not make any difference to me what party the Secretary is a member of or what his name is, I have confidence in the man who is nominated to that high office, and I, for one, would be perfectly willing to let the repayments be specified not in a short number of years but a liberal period or within the useful life of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman seen any of the department heads in the last

5, 8, or 10 years do things that were not good sound business?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not hold any briefs for all of the departments of Government. I quarrel with them some myself, but not on a partisan basis. I want to say this about this bill: I have been up in the Columbia Basin. I know of the growth of the great Pacific Northwest, I think perhaps the fastest growing section of America. However, it has a close rival in the Pacific Southwest, as I happen to know. Now, here is a vast undeveloped empire along the Columbia River. The war developments, such as the founding of the atomic bomb plant along the Columbia River, took off of the tax rolls a good many fruitful acres. I think that as a matter of repairing war-time damages the Government of the United States owes something to this particular project in this community in order that we may replace the investment which has otherwise been taken off the tax rolls and the land taken out of production. That is exactly what this bill will do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say this, that I quite agree that there are a lot of things that we can do to put our country in shape, things that ought to be done, rather than building up all the nations of the world which sometimes I think might be used against us rather than for us.

Mr. MURDOCK. I perfectly agree with the gentleman on putting our country in shape. Now, gentlemen, this country must increase its food producing facilities, and this is one way of doing it. We must bring under cultivation more and more fruitful acres, not in competition with the eastern part of the country, but in the growing of specialty crops such as they grow out there, and which they grow most abundantly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the consideration of these matters we must bear in mind that this is 1943. It is not 1843. We are a nation now of 145,000,000 people. We are a great industrial and agricultural nation, and we are very fortunate in that respect. But, in connection with these great problems we have to consider the national interests of the country in the light of our national economy in 1948 and the years to come, and not think in terms of 100 or 200 years ago when our population was less, and when our country was confined to that portion of the United States east of the Mississippi, and when we had mainly an agricultural economy.

Our problems are entirely different today, and legislators have to give that consideration in connection with the economic life of our people today and tomorrow.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has time and time again wisely and generously gone along with us on western development, when some of our own neighbors have failed us.

The gentleman is exactly right. This great country is *e pluribus unum*. That is what we have written on the dollar. From 13 small States on the Atlantic coast we have spread clear across this magnificent continent to the Pacific. It is men with vision on the eastern seaboard, as exemplified by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that have made this possible. That is what I am pleading for not only with regard to this bill but with regard to many other bills which would develop the great West as a national estate ought to be developed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman think about a lot of Members of Congress who are not only trying to take care of the people in this country but seem to think that we have to give the foodstuffs we grow and the things we manufacture to foreign countries by the billions of dollars, when at the same time we increase the price of our own commodities to our own people? How does the gentleman reconcile a lot of the things this country has been doing, and what does he think our people are going to say when they have to pay 10, 15, or 20 percent more for the food and the clothing they need for themselves?

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution but it has little bearing on this bill. I simply want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I will give consideration to his philosophy on foreign matters. We are talking now about a domestic matter, the development of this country as it ought to be developed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in no way even remotely relevant to the matter under discussion today.

Mr. RICH. Certainly it is.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I said not even remotely relevant. However, the gentleman did make some observation about the increase in the cost of living. The increase in the cost of living is due entirely to the fact that our Republican friends kidded the public 2 years ago and then took off price controls. The reason the cost of living went up is that price controls were taken off, and the responsibility rests with the Republican Party.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends on the Democratic side and the Republican side to give their support to this meritorious measure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am taking only a minute to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman talks about the regulations they put on the American people and screwed down in every way possible private initiative, getting us back to a country like Russia, where they regulate everything. I want America free. I want America to produce. I am interested in investing money in these projects in

order that we may grow the things the American people want so that we may have happiness and contentment; but, after we do all these things for our own American people, I do not want to give everything away to foreign countries without any remuneration or thought of trying to help the American people. I am for America and free enterprise. That is the reason I do not want to give America away to some other nation that is going to turn around after a while and probably give us the boot. I do not want anything like that. You have gone too far for other nations and not far enough for our American citizens.

Keep America to the front. Keep America strong. If we do not save America and our American free enterprise and our American freedom, I am certain no other nation will do it for us. I am not selfish. I just want to be safe and sound for our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of irrigating lands; of generating, transmitting, and marketing hydroelectric energy; for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife; and looking to the completion of the Yakima project, there is hereby authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, composed of the following principal units, to wit:

Prosser-Chandler power canal.
Chandler hydroelectric power and hydraulic pumping plant.
Main canal.
Kiona wasteway.
Amon siphon and hydraulic pumping plant.
Amon wasteway.
Lateral system.
Improvements for fish and wildlife.

Sec. 2. Construction costs allocated to the conservation and propagation of fish and wildlife by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.), and operation and maintenance costs attributable to operations for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for the sale of electric power and energy not required for project uses, hereinafter termed commercial power and energy, at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales of power and energy, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements; (2) the return, within 78 years from the date upon which each feature becomes revenue producing, of an appropriate share of the construction investment properly allocable by the Secretary to commercial power and energy together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum; (3) the return, without interest, within a period of 78 years, and, with respect to each irrigation block, within a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs of that share of the investment found by the Secretary to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for repayment of those construction costs of the development assigned to be repaid by the project water users, which, in the discretion of the Secretary, may require, among other things, that those charges be distributed between the presently irrigated lands and the new lands and among farm units in a manner that takes into account the productivity of the land and in the case of new lands the estimated cost of preparing the land for irrigation, all in the manner and to the extent that the Secretary shall find to be proper: *Provided*, That these charges shall be such as will provide for the payment of (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provisions for replacements, and (2) repayment within a period of 78 years without interest of an appropriate share of that part of the construction cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be repaid by the water users.

Sec. 5. The power and energy revenues to be applied toward the fulfillment of the obligation to return that share of the investment found by the Secretary to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power and energy revenues may include one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purposes from power revenues.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct extra capacity in the main canal for the future irrigation of approximately 7,000 acres of land, in addition to the presently proposed development, and to recognize the cost of providing such extra capacity as a deferred obligation to be paid at such time as the additional area may be brought into the project.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 3, strike out "seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "of seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "of seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BREHM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington, pursuant to House Resolution 550, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 551 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for House Joint Resolution 334, which gives the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to make possible the continued operation of Meharry College at Nashville, Tenn.

Meharry College is devoted to training Negro doctors, dentists, and nurses. It is one of the outstanding medical schools in the country, supplying medical men and women to the 7,000,000 Negroes in the Southeast.

For the past 10 years Meharry College has been largely supported by grants from the Carnegie Foundation, and other endowments. A large portion of these grants terminate on June 30 of this year, and the college finds itself without the wherewithal to continue its operations.

The financial plight of the college was brought to the attention of the Conference of Southern Governors at their meeting at Tallahassee in February. At that time the college offered to turn over all of its land, buildings, equipment, and the income from its endowments to the Southern States jointly. The Governors of 14 States entered into a tentative agreement to establish a board of control for southern regional education to administer Meharry College. Under this tentative agreement, each of the Southern States would make an annual contribution to the college, and thereby allow it to continue in operation.

Now, this agreement between the Governors is tentative pending the approval

of this joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to it. It is specifically provided in article I, section 10, clause 3 of the Constitution that "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Congress has already given its consent to 101 of these interstate compacts, so House Joint Resolution 334 does not establish a precedent.

Under the rule, 1 hour has been allowed for general debate. The joint resolution is simple in form and substance, and 1 hour should be more than sufficient to provide adequate consideration of it. The rule does not provide any preferential treatment for the joint resolution except consideration, so I know there can be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, with Mr. DOLLIVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution was considered and reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary by Subcommittee No. 1, of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to make it possible for the Southern States named in the resolution to enter into a compact or agreement relating to the establishment of a board of control for southern regional education, to the end that the several States signatory to the compact shall pool their interests and their resources so that better colleges, universities, and other institutions looking to more complete educational facilities can be provided in the region covered by the compact.

The enactment of this resolution will in no way obligate the Federal Government financially. All expenses of the proposed projects are to be borne by the respective States interested.

This proposal is before the Congress because the Constitution of the United States requires that—

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, . . . enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power (art. I, sec. 10, clause 3).

In short, all that is here contemplated is the approval of the Congress of the compact referred to.

Many compacts in the past have been entered into between two or more of the States. I can think of no legitimate objection that can be raised to the desire

of these States to jointly provide better educational facilities for their children. Everybody favors adequate education for all the children throughout the land. Some States are more able financially than some other States to furnish these facilities.

The only question that might be raised here is as to the issue of segregated schools. It is clear that the Governor and State officials of a State cannot enter into any compact or agreement with other States except that such compact comes within the scope of the State constitution and the State statutes. It is true that some Southern States, like Alabama, provide for separate schools for colored children and white children. If this compact is approved, then the Governor of Alabama cannot bind his State to help finance any type of school other than an Alabama constitutional school.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States, is the law of the land insofar as race discrimination is concerned. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] a very capable member of the Judiciary Committee, made a statement to the committee in this regard, and I hope that he will repeat that statement for our information here today.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have segregation in the schools in the State from which I come. We do have splendid schools, and it is the intent of the people of the State of Michigan to give all of our youth equal opportunity to acquire higher education in our public schools. Now if the children in some of the Southern States do not have the same advantage, whether they be colored children or white children, I can see no reason why this Congress should prevent either the white or the colored children from having better educational opportunities. While I realize that these States, in providing the schools contemplated in this compact, must, unless their State constitutions and laws are changed, conduct colored schools and white schools and regardless of how I feel about segregation in the schools, nevertheless I recognize the situation as it is. I shall, therefore, vote to approve this resolution, thereby aiding the children of these States to receive more educational advantage even though for the present that education must be given in segregated schools.

The recent Oklahoma case guarantees equality of facilities. If we believe in educating our youth, and certain States do not agree with other States as to segregation, it seems to me that our obligation to the young people—white and colored—is such that we should do the practical thing and approve this compact and let the constitutionality of segregation be determined in the proper forum in due course. In voting for this resolution I am not voting to establish segregation in the schools; I am only voting to improve the type of schooling the children in these States are now receiving.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], who

will control the time for the majority of the committee.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution was voted out of the Committee on Judiciary and is the result of a conference of the governors of the Southern States, wherein they propose, with the consent of Congress, that their respective States be authorized to pool their interests in the matter of establishing and maintaining institutions of higher education. It requires no Federal aid and has no bearing whatsoever on the high schools or intermediate schools, but only those above the high-school grade. This, I am informed, has been in contemplation by the conference of southern governors and by the legislatures of the various Southern States since 1935. It proposes on a larger scale a program that has prevailed within a great many States of the Union with regard to schools of a lower grade. In Illinois, for instance, we have for many years been establishing consolidated grade- and high-school districts. These districts so consolidated have pooled their resources in order to establish and maintain better educational facilities for the children they serve.

Under this resolution the Southern States, with the consent of Congress, and with the approval of their own State legislatures will likewise cooperate, each with the others who are parties to the compact to share proportionately the expenses incident to the establishment and maintenance of institutions of higher education. The funds necessary for this project would be prorated to each State in accordance with its respective population.

The system will be governed by a commission of which each of the governors of the participating States will be ex officio members, together with two other members chosen by the governor of each individual State. The commission, thus formed, will be the governing body which will control the institutions and the colleges that will be established.

It seems a fair and logical way in which these States will be enabled to improve and expand the opportunities for their citizens to avail themselves of high-class institutions of learning that would be burdensome if attempted by each State individually. It has the approval of many noted educators and is a progressive step that will be highly beneficial.

I believe the resolution ought to receive the consent of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the resolution under consideration is the usual type of resolution that has been adopted by the Congress on upwards of a hundred occasions. It is designed to meet the constitutional requirements that the Congress give its consent to compacts entered into between the States.

In the instant case a number of States, as the gentleman from Illinois just stated, have entered into a compact the purpose of which is to provide institutions of higher learning in sections of

the country which otherwise would not have the advantage of these institutions.

As I understand, there is presently a college being maintained by several of the States. It is hoped that this institution will be enlarged and that its advantages can be extended to citizens of all of the contracting States.

I. THE COMPACT OF SOUTHERN GOVERNORS FOR REGIONAL EDUCATION WILL PERPETUATE SEGREGATED EDUCATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed resolution will give the approval of Congress to the compact entered into by the governors of nine Southern States which provides for the ownership and operation of Meharry Medical College at Nashville, Tenn., on a joint basis by a Board of Control for Southern Regional Education and for the purchase and operation of other institutions of higher learning on a regional basis. Aside from the specific mention of Meharry Medical College, the compact gives no indication on its face that it is intended to support the system of segregation. However, since the laws of each of the States participating in the plan require segregated education in some instances under threat of criminal prosecution, there can be no doubt that the compact will crystallize the pattern of segregation and furnish the economic underpinning for the support of segregated education in the South which is staggering under the recent Supreme Court decisions and the aroused demands of Negro Americans for equality in education. That the southern governors propose to run the institutions on a segregated basis is demonstrated by the speeches made at the meeting of the southern governors, legislators, and educators held in Washington on February 24, 1948, immediately preceding the introduction of this resolution into Congress—see New York Times, February 25, 1948. Speakers at that conference made it clear that the proposal to take over Meharry Medical College stems from their fear that should Meharry close its doors, all the Negro students there would demand admission to the white medical schools supported by the States.

II. THE PROPOSAL THAT CONGRESS APPROVE THIS COMPACT IS A POLITICAL MOVE TO COMMIT CONGRESS TO THE SUPPORT OF SEGREGATION

While article I, section 10, of the United States Constitution provides that no State shall enter into any compact or agreement with another State without the consent of Congress, there is ample legal authority that this restraint is concerned not with such matters as extradition, wage scales, or education, but merely with compacts or agreements which affect the national supremacy and encroach upon the power of the Federal Government—*Virginia v. Tennessee* (148 U. S. 503), *Wharton v. Wise* (153 U. S. 155), and *Dixie Wholesale Grocery v. Martin* (278 Ky. 705, 129 S. W. 2 (d), 181). See also charge to the grand jury of Federal District Judge William Clark, of New Jersey, reported at Fourteenth Federal Supplement, page 596.

If the purposes of the compact are bona fide, the Southern States can provide education for all their citizens by mutual assistance without coming to Congress for approval. It is only be-

cause the compact seeks to weaken the Supreme Court opinions in the Gaines case and the Sipuel case that congressional approval is sought. It is also true that since Congress knows that the laws of the contracting States require segregation, congressional approval of this compact would constitute a complete repudiation by Congress of the findings and recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Higher Education.

III. THE PROPOSAL TO SEND NEGRO STUDENTS FROM ALL OVER THE SOUTH TO MEHARRY MEDICAL COLLEGE INSTEAD OF ADMITTING THEM TO THE EXISTING STATE UNIVERSITIES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

As the result of two cases taken by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to the Supreme Court, it is now established that the responsibility of the Southern States to educate their Negro citizens cannot completely be met by any plan which would force a Negro student from Texas to attend a regional medical school in Tennessee while his white compatriot attends the University of Texas Medical School. In *Gaines v. Canada* (305 U. S. 337), decided in 1938, Missouri was told that its plan of providing out-of-State scholarships for Negroes was unconstitutional. In 1948, in the Sipuel case, Oklahoma was told that Negroes could not be forced to wait until the State had time to set up a segregated institution, but must receive their education as soon as it is furnished to white students. The proposed compact appears to be based upon the theory that with congressional approval the States can, for purposes of education, extend their boundaries to a region and that the requirements of the Supreme Court will be met so long as education is furnished within that region. This is a twisted reasoning, which argues that what each Southern State is forbidden to do individually can be accomplished if some of them act together. In reality, so long as a State provides education to white students within its boundaries there is no legal way for it to deny such education to its Negro citizens.

IV. SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION IS DISCRIMINATORY AND UNEQUAL AND IS IN ITSELF UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The NAACP is now preparing to carry at least two cases, involving the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma, to the United States Supreme Court on evidence which will conclusively establish that under a segregated educational system Negroes receive unequal treatment and that segregation in education is therefore unconstitutional. Should Congress approve this compact during the pendency of those cases in the face of the findings of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Higher Education, it will be tantamount to Congress making a legislative finding that there is no discrimination in the educational systems of those States. Such a finding would be extremely dangerous and harmful in presenting these cases to the Supreme Court.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, the pending House joint resolution giving consent of the Congress to a compact

entered into by a number of Southern States should be adopted without delay.

This compact is not, as some have supposed and intimated, being proposed on the spur of the moment because of an opinion of the United States Supreme Court. It has, on the other hand been contemplated for many years and considerable research by experts in the field of higher education has been done in preparation for this program.

It is rooted in a clear recognition that the problems relating to higher education, particularly in professional and specialized fields can better be solved on a regional than on a State basis.

While the program envisioned under the provisions of this compact is broad and of long range, there is a particular reason why early action by the Congress should be taken because of a situation confronting an educational institution in my own district.

Unless some plan is adopted looking toward the future operation of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn., that institution will be forced to close its doors at the end of the present term.

This college is highly accredited and recognized as a leading institution. Because of the dwindling income of the endowment funds an operating deficit has faced the college each year for the past 5 years, that deficit ranging from \$120,000 to \$300,000.

At present there are 482 Negro students pursuing courses in medicine and dentistry at Meharry. About 63 percent of these are from the South; 32 percent from the North and the remainder from the West and our possessions and Territories.

The foundations have agreed to continue financing providing the Congress, by its approval of this resolution, gives assurance that the transfer of Meharry to the Southern States as a regional college can be effected at a reasonably early date. Otherwise the college will close its doors in July and 482 Negro students will have no place to go.

It is extremely unfortunate that some elements have injected into this proposal the question of discrimination or segregation. With the exception of Howard College here in the Capital and Meharry College, there were in 1947 only 86 Negro students studying medicine in 21 colleges that admit them on a competitive basis with white students.

Meharry and Howard have trained more than 85 percent of the Negro doctors practicing in the country and Meharry alone has trained about 56 percent of the total.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, if a competitive basis applying the national average on aptitude tests by 14,000 applicants for admission last year, had been rigidly followed Meharry could have accepted only 5 and Howard 9 students for the freshman classes.

This regional plan offers the only hope for continued operation of Meharry. It can be acquired under the terms of this compact and Negro students in even larger numbers may there be trained to render medical services in a highly credited institution.

This compact, in my opinion, and the program that will become possible in the

South under its provisions, may well become a pattern that will be followed in other sections of the country in the field of higher education.

Its approval by the Congress is of far-reaching importance.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, recognizing the great need of opportunities for higher learning for Negroes in the fields of medicine, dentistry, and other professional and educational pursuits, I am loath to vote against any resolution or bill which will give aid and assistance toward achieving this goal.

Notwithstanding the high purposes nor intending to impugn the motives of those who sponsor House Joint Resolution 334, for my part I desire to keep the record clear on racial segregation. In my opinion congressional approval of this resolution could very well be interpreted as placing the stamp of approval on the principle of segregation.

In view of recent Supreme Court decisions and in view of the gradual progress that is being made, I decline to take any action which possibly can be interpreted as tending to nullify the Supreme Court decisions, and therefore have decided to cast my vote against the passage of this resolution.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the compact entered into at the conference of southern governors at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, between the States of Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, and such other States named therein who have or may become parties thereto, to wit, the States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Oklahoma, said compact relating to the establishment of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education, providing for the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions on a regional basis, supported by public funds derived from taxation by the constituent States, in accordance with the terms, provisions, and conditions set out and contained in said compact, is hereby consented to by the Congress of the United States of America—

Mr. REED of Illinois (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD together with the committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 7, add the following: "said compact 8 herein referred to being as follows:

"Whereas the States who are parties hereto have during the past several years conducted careful investigation looking towards the establishment and maintenance of jointly owned and operated regional educational institutions in the Southern States in the professional, technological, scientific, literary and other fields, so as to provide greater educational advantages and facilities for the citizens of the several States who reside within such region; and

"Whereas Meharry Medical College of Nashville, Tenn., has proposed that its lands

buildings, equipment, and the net income from its endowment be turned over to the Southern States, or to an agency acting in their behalf, to be operated as a regional institution for medical, dental and nursing education upon terms and conditions to be hereafter agreed upon between the Southern States and Meharry Medical College, which proposal, because of the present financial condition of the institution, has been approved by the said States who are parties hereto; and

"Whereas the said States desire to enter into a compact with each other providing for the planning and establishment of regional educational facilities; and

"Now therefore, in consideration of the mutual agreements, covenants, and obligations assumed by the respective States who are parties hereto (hereinafter referred to as 'States'), the said several States do hereby form a geographical district or region consisting of the areas lying within the boundaries of the contracting States which, for the purposes of this compact, shall constitute an area for regional education supported by public funds derived from taxation by the constituent States for the establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of regional educational schools and institutions for the benefit of citizens of the respective States residing within the region so established as may be determined from time to time in accordance with the terms and provisions of this compact.

"The States do further hereby establish and create a joint agency which shall be known as the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'board'), the members of which board shall consist of the governor of each State, ex officio, and two additional citizens of each State to be appointed by the governor thereof, at least one of whom shall be selected from the field of education. The governor shall continue as a member of the board during his tenure of office as governor of the State, but the members of the board appointed by the governor shall hold office for a period of 5 years except that in the original appointment one board member so appointed by the governor shall be designated at the time of his appointment to serve an initial term of 3 years, but thereafter his successor shall serve the full term of 5 years. Vacancies on the board caused by death, resignation, refusal, or inability to serve, shall be filled by appointment by the governor for the unexpired portion of the term. The officers of the board shall be a chairman, a vice chairman, a secretary, a treasurer, and such additional officers as may be created by the board from time to time. The board shall meet annually and officers shall be elected to hold office until the next annual meeting. The board shall have the right to formulate and establish bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of this compact to govern its own actions in the performance of the duties delegated to it including the right to create and appoint an executive committee and a finance committee with such powers and authority as the board may delegate to them from time to time.

"It shall be the duty of the board to submit plans and recommendations to the States from time to time for their approval and adoption by appropriate legislative action for the development, establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of educational schools and institutions within the geographical limits of the regional area of the States, of such character and type and for such educational purposes, professional, technological, scientific, literary, or otherwise, as they may deem and determine to be proper, necessary, or advisable. Title to all such educational institutions when so established by appropriate legislative actions of the States and to all properties and facilities used in connection therewith shall be vested in

said board as the agency of and for the use and benefit of the said States and the citizens thereof, and all such educational institutions shall be operated, maintained, and financed in the manner herein set out, subject to any provisions or limitations which may be contained in the legislative acts of the States authorizing the creation, establishment, and operation of such educational institutions.

"The board shall have such additional and general power and authority as may be vested in it by the States from time to time by legislative enactments of the said States.

"Any two or more States who are parties of this compact shall have the right to enter into supplemental agreements providing for the establishment, financing, and operation of regional educational institutions for the benefit of citizens residing within an area which constitutes a portion of the general region herein created, such institutions to be financed exclusively by such States and to be controlled exclusively by the members of the board representing such States provided such agreement is submitted to and approved by the board prior to the establishment of such institutions.

"Each State agrees that, when authorized by the legislature, it will from time to time make available and pay over to said Board such funds as may be required for the establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of such regional educational institutions as may be authorized by the States under the terms of this compact, the contribution of each State at all times to be in the proportion that its population bears to the total combined population of the States who are parties hereto as shown from time to time by the most recent official published report of the Bureau of Census of the United States of America or upon such other basis as may be agreed upon.

"This compact shall not take effect or be binding upon any State unless and until it shall be approved by proper legislative action of as many as six or more of the States whose governors have subscribed hereto within a period of 18 months from the date hereof. When and if six or more States shall have given legislative approval to this compact within said 18 months period, it shall be and become binding upon such six or more States 60 days after the date of legislative approval by the sixth State and the Governors of such six or more States shall forthwith name the members of the Board from their States as hereinabove set out, and the Board shall then meet on call of the Governor of any State approving this compact, at which time the Board shall elect officers, adopt bylaws, appoint committees, and otherwise fully organize. Other States whose names are subscribed hereto shall thereafter become parties hereto upon approval of this compact by legislative action within 2 years from the date hereof, upon such conditions as may be agreed upon at the time.

"After becoming effective this compact shall thereafter continue without limitation of time: *Provided, however*, That it may be terminated at any time by unanimous action of the States: *And provided further*, That any State may withdraw from this compact if such withdrawal is approved by its legislature, such withdrawal to become effective 2 years after written notice thereof to the Board accompanied by a certified copy of the requisite legislative action, but such withdrawal shall not relieve the withdrawing State from its obligations hereunder accruing up to the effective date of such withdrawal. Any State so withdrawing shall ipso facto cease to have any claim to or ownership of any of the property held or vested in the Board or to any of the funds of the Board held under the terms of this compact.

"If any State shall at any time become in default in the performance of any of its obligations assumed herein or with respect to any obligation imposed upon said State as authorized by and in compliance with the

terms and provisions of this compact, all rights, privileges and benefits of such defaulting State, its members on the Board and its citizens shall ipso facto be and become suspended from and after the date of such default. Unless such default shall be remedied and made good within a period of 1 year immediately following the date of such default this compact may be terminated with respect to such defaulting State by an affirmative vote of three-fourths of the members of the Board (exclusive of the members representing the State in default), from and after which time such State shall cease to be a party to this compact and shall have no further claim to or ownership of any of the property held by or vested in the Board or to any of the funds of the Board held under the terms of this compact, but such termination shall in no manner release such defaulting State from any accrued obligation or otherwise effect this compact or the rights, duties, privileges or obligations of the remaining States thereunder.

"In witness whereof this compact has been approved and signed by the Governors of the several States, subject to the approval of their respective legislatures in the manner hereinabove set out, as of the 8th day of February 1948.

"By MILLARD CALDWELL,
Governor, State of Florida.

"By WM. PRESTON LANE, Jr.,
Governor, State of Maryland.

"By M. E. THOMPSON,
Governor, State of Georgia.

"By ————,
Governor, State of Louisiana.

"By JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor, State of Alabama.

"By F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor, State of Mississippi.

"By ————,
Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"By JIM MCCORD,
Governor, State of Tennessee.

"By ————,
Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia.

"By BEN LANEY,
Governor, State of Arkansas.

"By ————,
Governor, State of North Carolina.

"By J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor, State of South Carolina.

"By BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor, State of Texas.

"By ————,
Governor, State of Oklahoma.

"By ————,
Governor, State of West Virginia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending resolution, which places the congressional stamp of approval on segregation in education. Congress cannot permit itself to place its stamp of approval thereon. How we can do it in light of the decision which the Supreme Court handed down only yesterday is beyond me.

I read from a letter which I received from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a letter that was sent to every Member of Congress:

We solicit your vigorous opposition to House Joint Resolution 334. This resolution asks Congress to approve a compact entered into on February 8, 1948, and signed by 14 Southern governors to make Meharry Medical School, located in Nashville, Tenn., a regional school for Negroes and to establish other regional schools. It was reported

favorably by the House Judiciary Committee on February 16 without careful analysis, public hearings, or any opportunity whatsoever for the groups gravely affected by the compact to express their views.

Our principal reasons for opposing this resolution are these:

1. The testimony of the proponents of this legislation before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee established by their own admission that the regional institutions would be operated on a segregated basis. It is also an undisputed fact that the laws of every State signatory to this compact require segregation in education.

2. It is our conviction after careful consideration of all the facts and surrounding circumstances, that it represents a bold attempt to circumvent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Missouri vs. University of Oklahoma* (January 12, 1948) which require States to furnish to Negro students educational opportunity equal to that furnished white students within the State boundaries.

3. Congress should not put its stamp of approval on racial segregation.

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the reasons set forth by the association, on the basis of the decision in *Missouri against University of Oklahoma*, on the basis of the decision handed down yesterday with reference to restricted covenants, in the light of conditions that exist throughout the world today, to pass this resolution is simply placing the stamp of approval on segregation. By this resolution Congress gives its blessing to the brazen violations of the fourteenth amendment that exists in these States that have entered into this compact. I most strenuously urge the membership of this House to reject the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard these attacks from this so-called Association for the Advancement of the Colored People before. The organization does not represent the better element of the Negroes of this country. In fact it is doing the Negroes of this country, and especially of the South, infinitely more harm than good. It is not interested in the welfare of the Negroes of the South, and neither is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

We passed a bill for the establishment of a Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia recently. It was supported and sponsored by the Booker T. Washington Foundation, and by the Negroes of the Booker T. Washington Institute who came here and worked incessantly for the passage of that measure. Yet, we had this bunch representing enemy interests come in here and try to block its passage, because they say they are opposed to segregation.

Here the people of the South are offering the Negroes an institution the like of which they have never had before. Yet, this organization, which I regard as a Communist front, is bending every effort to defeat it.

If you really want to do something for the Negroes of this country, and at the same time maintain peace between the two races, vote for this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the argument advanced by the distinguished gentleman from New York is answered in the very decision he mentions, the decision handed down by the Supreme Court late yesterday afternoon. From a very casual examination of that decision I have reached the conclusion that if there are any agreements whereby colored people would not be provided with the same educational advantages which the white people have, under this decision that agreement would not be valid and would be stricken down.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to part of the decision in which the Court said:

The power of the Federal courts to enforce the terms of private agreements is at all times exercised subject to the restrictions and limitations of the public policy of the United States as manifested in the Constitution, treaties, Federal statutes, and applicable legal precedents. Where the enforcement of private agreements would be violative of that policy, it is the obligation of courts to refrain from such exertions of judicial power.

We are here concerned with action of Federal courts of such a nature that if taken by the courts of a State would violate the prohibitory provisions of the fourteenth amendment. *Shelley versus Kraemer*, supra. It is not consistent with the public policy of the United States to permit Federal courts in the Nation's Capital to exercise general equitable powers to compel action denied the State courts where such State action has been held to be violative of the guaranty of the equal protection of the laws. We cannot presume that the public policy of the United States manifests a lesser concern for the protection of such basic rights against discriminatory action of Federal courts than against such action taken by the courts of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this very decision is a complete answer to the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to assure the distinguished gentleman from New York, and any others who may have any doubt, that the purpose of this resolution is to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court. This is the first opportunity that the South has ever had, due to poor financial status, even by pooling resources, to build really worth-while institutions of higher learning for any of its citizens in all the broad field of graduate study.

May I point out, too, that not only is this compact approved by the very foundations that have made the appropriations to make it possible for Meharry College at Nashville, Tenn., to exist and to render the most efficient service that has ever been rendered to our colored friends, graduating more than half of the doctors and dentists of that race, and also approved by its student body of over 500 pupils; not only that, but you all received this letter from Meharry College, from which I quote:

This plan is supported by the Meharry alumni who as professional men and women realize the profound consequences. It is supported by the Meharry undergraduates who see at stake their whole professional

careers and their opportunity to be of service to their people. It would be supported, if its implications were correctly understood, by the majority of the Negro population.

Not only that, members of the committee, but it is endorsed strongly by the head and by the board of directors of the Carnegie Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and every other foundation that is interested in the promotion of better race relations and of giving adequate post-graduate schooling to both races. It is the only chance we have ever had. What we want to do is to cooperate with the Julius Rosenwald fund that has done so much for us in the South and with these other agencies, and with the 410 best minds in the educational field. There is not a single one, so far as the record shows, or so far as I know, who, as an educator of national standing, is opposed to the purpose of this compact. There is not a thing in the world in this resolution or in the imagination of anyone who understands, that could promote any ill will or hatred. There is not a thing here that could possibly lead to anything but good for both races. We beg of Congress nothing but its consent to this compact so that it may be employed to give us the only chance we have ever had of giving to our brothers in black, and our own children, the higher education to which we feel they are entitled.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CHELF. For the purpose of the record, I might say to the gentlemen here who make up the committee, that I happened to serve on Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary which had to do with this bill when it was first introduced. I happen to know that no one appeared in opposition to the bill, and when the subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], our beloved subcommittee chairman, reported the bill to the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary, we delayed it for another two or three meetings so as to give anyone in opposition an opportunity to be heard. I believe that the only communication which our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] received, was a wire from the city of New York, from some organization, that said they were displeased. So, there was no one who appeared in opposition to the bill at all, before our committees, yet we still postponed action by the full committee until the opposition had been given full hearing by the Senate subcommittee.

Mr. HOBBS. The passage and approval of this resolution would cost the National Government nothing. It would simply give the consent of Congress to the compact tentatively entered into at the conference of southern governors at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The Constitution of the United States requires:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress . . . enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power (art. I, sec. 10, clause 3).

One hundred and one interstate compacts have been approved by Congress.

None, seriously suggested, has ever been denied.

This compact is set forth in extenso in the resolution.

The conference of southern governors has been working toward this laudable end since 1935. The signatory States have now, for the first time, become financially able to establish and support such schools. For many of them, if not all, it is still impossible to finance, individually, such schools of the high standard of excellence contemplated.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the compact—House Joint Resolution 334—sponsored by the Governors of our Southern States for the regional education program should be adopted. It is my information that for the past several years the Southern Governors' Conference has been studying and considering and working toward solution of the problem of providing better educational facilities in the South on a regional basis in the field of higher education. The compact which the southern governors have presented for approval by the Congress has been thoroughly debated and considered for many months. The resolution which we are considering here today giving congressional approval to the compact has been the subject of extensive hearings both by the Senate and the House Judiciary Committees and the resolution has been passed by the Senate. Final approval of the compact now only requires passage by the House and approval by the President to insure the accomplishment of the long-planned higher education program in the South.

I have studied the compact and the hearings on this measure. This measure is one of the most progressive and forward moves that has been presented in many years and I therefore hope that the resolution will be adopted without dissent. With the adoption of this compact two or more or several of the Southern States may construct and build extensive higher educational institutions and advance the cause of education in the South, particularly in the professions and fields of highly specialized technical training. Someone has advanced the idea that each State should provide individually such educational institutions. This is entirely unnecessary and cannot in reality be accomplished for practical reasons. Such a move would be too expensive and furthermore the number of students from individual States attending these advanced and higher educational institutions would be too limited and small in number to justify such schools in every State. On a regional basis all of the States in the southern area can participate and construct and build great institutions of higher learning.

The program offers immediate advantages that cannot be realized by the several States independent of each other for a great number of years. Furthermore, educators have long pointed out the advantages of providing regional educational institutions. Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation, along with many other outstanding educators, has endorsed the scheme. Inevitably, such a program

will follow in other sections of the Nation. Various regions of our country are becoming known as sections for specialized education. As an example, Georgia Tech at Atlanta is considered one of the most outstanding engineering schools in the South. Vanderbilt University School of Medicine is considered one of the most outstanding, if not the most outstanding, medical school in the South. Students desiring to study medicine come from all over the South and other States to attend Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. All of the States of the South do not have comparable medical schools and some States do not afford medical education to students of their State at all. There is no reason why this compact should not be approved, thereby permitting the States of the South to pool their resources and work toward the building and maintaining of regional universities—schools of higher learning in the technical sciences and professions. There is a great need for such educational institutions, especially in the South, and the adoption of this resolution will implement and forward this most worth-while planning and endeavor. With its adoption we will see in time the growth of large medical and dental schools, schools of forestry, mining, engineering, and veterinary science, and other professional and technical schools providing advanced training in the South on a regional basis. As an initial step in this direction the compact provides for the acquisition of Meharry Medical College located at Nashville, Tenn., to be jointly owned, operated, and controlled by the Southern States and to be operated as a regional institution through funds afforded by contributions from the Southern States. This is only one of several such schools that will result from the adoption of the resolution authorizing regional educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a step in the right direction and represents a solution to a most pressing problem. I am pleased to give the measure my support and I trust that the compact may be speedily approved and higher education advanced in the South.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEVITT: On page 2, line 7, after the comma insert "Provided, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions under the compact be not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in accordance with a suggestion made by the Attorney General of the United States speaking through Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General. The recommendation was made in a letter dated March 15, 1948, sent by Mr. Ford to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, in connection with hearings held in that body on Senate Joint Resolution 191, a companion measure to the resolution we are considering today. It appears that the objectives of this House joint resolution were very commendable, but I

think we should make very sure that the Congress does not put its stamp of approval upon any contemplated action which may be contrary to the Constitution or the laws of the United States. The amendment I have offered seeks to negative any such intent on the part of the Congress.

Article I, section 10 of the Constitution requires that the Congress give its consent to any agreement or compact between the States. This resolution today is a technical compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. It is not within the province of the Congress to determine legislative policy within the various States. The constitutions and laws of some of the States of the Union contain provisions which may well be at variance with the Constitution and laws of the United States. For this Congress to give its blanket approval to the compact without an expression of the kind embodied in my amendment would be an action which by inference would give congressional approval to those doubtful provisions of the various State constitutions and laws dealing with discrimination and segregation.

Just yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Hurd against Hodge, et al., held that the judicial branch of the Government would not give its approbation to real-estate covenants prohibiting the transfer of certain properties to persons of the colored race, and denied the use of the Federal judicial machinery in an action seeking to enforce such covenants. The judicial branch of the Government has refused its approbation of such nonconstitutional principle; the legislative branch of the Government should refuse to give its sanction to a compact, the execution of which will undoubtedly involve the application of State constitutional provisions and laws which are of doubtful constitutionality. The amendment offered seeks to withhold congressional approval of State constitutional and legislative enactments at variance with our United States Constitution and laws.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman merely provides in his amendment that nothing in this resolution shall be in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. DEVITT. That is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With all due respect to the gentleman, we might as well add the Lord's Prayer to that amendment.

Mr. DEVITT. I would be glad to add that if it were germane.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman ought to be realistic and put in what the Supreme Court said.

Mr. DEVITT. If the gentleman wants to amend my amendment, the gentleman is free to do so. I will be very happy to have him do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With all due respect, may I say to the gentleman that his amendment is meaningless?

Mr. DEVITT. I will leave that to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 9, line 24, insert a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 2. This consent of the Congress of the United States of America shall not constitute nor be construed to constitute an endorsement of the principle of segregation in education."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a serious objection which I have heard voiced to this legislation is that by passing it this Congress would be placing its stamp of approval upon the principle of segregation in education. As we all know, there are some States, in fact, I think this applies to all of those who are signatories to this pact, which have in their State statutes or in their constitutions, or both, provisions for segregation in education. It is not within our power to change those provisions. There are other States, however, which do not recognize the principle of segregation in their public schools. It seems to me we should be extremely careful, if we adopt this legislation, not to take a step which the American people will construe as an effort to place the stamp of Federal approval upon the principle of segregation in education.

My friends from the Southern States, including the able author of this joint resolution, have repeatedly said that it was not the intention of this measure to approve of segregation.

It seems to me, therefore, that this proposed additional section, if it is not in conflict with the remainder of the joint resolution, is not objectionable. If it is in conflict with the remainder of the resolution, if the resolution is intended to say that we are placing the Federal stamp of approval on segregation in education, then there are many here, I feel sure, otherwise favorable to the resolution, who under those circumstances would oppose it.

As a matter of fact, I have serious doubt about the necessity for passing this joint resolution at all. All the measures heretofore adopted which approved compacts between the States relate to such things as apportionment of waters, construction of bridges or tunnels, boundary agreements, and the like. None of them have to do with anything akin to such an agreement as we are here discussing today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no need for this resolution?

Mr. KEATING. In my judgment, the States in question could probably accomplish what they are here seeking to do without a compact between them of such a nature as to require approval by the Congress.

Mr. WALTER. I would call the gentleman's attention to that part of article I, section 10 of the Constitution which

provides that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with any State.

Mr. KEATING. I am familiar with the constitutional provision. That is the very reason we are here. What I am saying is that the Supreme Court has held that the compacts referred to in the Constitution as requiring congressional consent are those which transcend Federal jurisdiction, rights, and powers, not all agreements. That point was emphasized by Governor Caldwell, of Florida, a witness before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. He referred to the Tennessee-Virginia case in which the Supreme Court so held.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was this amendment which is now under consideration submitted to the committee?

Mr. KEATING. The committee that had the bill under consideration is my own committee, I will say to the gentleman. I have submitted the amendment to certain members of the committee, some of whom think it is all right. The objection which others make to it is that it is in conflict with the main provisions of the bill itself. In other words, their position is that necessarily inherent in the joint resolution is a Federal pronouncement that we approve of segregation in education and that this amendment is, therefore, inconsistent with the underlying purpose of the measure. If that is its purpose, I cannot support it. The action taken on this amendment clarifies the issue.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course no one could think for a moment that the passage of this joint resolution would be an endorsement by the Congress of the principle of segregation in education. It simply does exactly the reverse. It gives its consent to the 15 Southern States to pool their resources and provide adequate post-graduate schooling for white and black under the existing segregation laws of those States, and that could not possibly include any endorsement by Congress of the principle of segregation. But it does recognize that under the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government has nothing whatsoever to do with the local affairs nor the powers of police in the several States. This resolution works hand in glove with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States by complying with the requirement that equal educational opportunity be offered each race. It does not lie within the power of Congress to strike down the segregation laws of any State which are now in existence. It does not endorse them. It simply gives consent of the Congress that the cooperating States might pool their resources and continue to operate in line with the Supreme Court decisions, by offering equal educational opportunities. It does not approve the status quo. It does not seek to change it. Therefore, with all due respect to the profound knowledge of my colleague of the Committee on the Judiciary, I do not believe

that his amendment is either apropos or wise.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the fact that it is the contention of the gentleman that this bill does not give Federal sanction to the principle of segregation, does the gentleman see any harm in our saying so in so many words?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, except that I think it would encumber the record in a way that you do not intend and that it is perfectly innocuous and of no effect. I think it would open the way to argument which would be hurtful. I beg your consideration of the main point that I am seeking to make, namely, that Congress could not if it would, and would not if it could, pass any law that is contrary to the Constitution of the United States and invade the province of the Southern States under our constitutional system of dual sovereignty.

For those reasons and for the further reason that the adoption of your amendment would be absolutely ineffective, save to stir up useless questions, debate, and possible strife, I urge that it be voted down.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word generally on the subject of compacts. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has said, the Constitution provides that no compact shall be entered into between the States without the consent of the Congress. This provision was inserted in the Constitution without much debate, and so far as I know without any opposition.

I have always felt that this matter of compacts between the States should be encouraged by the Congress and not discouraged. Many times States in the same general region might solve their problems by this compact method instead of coming down to Congress to have them solved here. For example, I think this resolution indicates a proper field within which the States may well operate. I know, for instance, that we have in Iowa one of the best agricultural colleges in the country. There are other nearby States that do not have our agricultural resources. We might well consider in Iowa the pooling of our agricultural resources with the mining resources and technical knowledge of other States, Minnesota, perhaps, and by our joint efforts with much less expenditure of money build up colleges which would be able to compete with the large colleges in the East.

I do not believe that the question of racial discrimination is involved at all in this resolution. The fourteenth amendment limits what a State may do in the matter of segregation and racial discrimination. That fourteenth amendment, of course, applies to the action of the States individually as well as collectively through a compact; so I say the question of racial discrimination is all beside the point in this debate.

Someone has suggested that ratification is not necessary, that the States

might act without ratification of the Congress. I do not so understand it. In most States a taxpayer's suit is the proper method of testing the legality of any expenditure. In most States the legislative body could not appropriate money to a college in some other State unless it proceeded through this method given in the Constitution. It could be challenged if done by a taxpayer's suit.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. With reference to the amendment, would it not be true that it would be presumed, without the language of the amendment, that Congress intended in this resolution that it should follow the Constitution and the laws of the land?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The Congress is obligated to follow the Constitution. I think a statement that we intend to do so adds nothing. The whole matter of racial discrimination is regulated by the fourteenth amendment as interpreted by the Court.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The South has been driven into a corner by Supreme Court decisions against the total denial of professional and graduate training to Negroes in southern tax-supported universities. But the old South is determined to hold on to racial segregation even in the face of bankruptcy if they obey the edict of the Supreme Court that they must supply substantially equal facilities to Negroes. To get off the horns of this dilemma, even temporarily, there has been introduced House Joint Resolution 334, asking the "consent of Congress to the compact regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948."

Enactment of such legislation is required by the Federal Constitution, which prohibits States entering into compacts without prior consent of the Congress. The southern governors piously declare that such regional schools are to be created for both white and Negro students. Not one of them believes for a minute that within foreseeable and calculable time the existing white schools of law, medicine, engineering, dentistry, pharmacy, forestry, and graduate education are going to be abandoned and their students sent off to regional schools.

Whatever shrinking of private funds for education may make necessary in the future, the sole purpose and intent at present of the regional plan, which experienced and wise Americans should have been intelligent enough to see, is to set up segregated regional schools for Negroes and not for whites. Intelligent Negroes and whites, particularly the former, see through this dishonest scheme and will oppose it with all the organizational and political power at their command. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that each State must meet its obligations to its citizens within the boundary of that State—which incidentally happens to be the bible of the States' righters.

Obviously aware both of the doubtful constitutionality of such enabling legis-

lation as well as of the rising opposition, proponents of the plan are attempting to jam this legislation through Congress with unprecedented speed. Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, secured almost instant approval by a Judiciary Subcommittee of the resolution—House Resolution 334—he introduced in the House of Representatives. Almost equally swift was the Senate in announcing hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 191. But they were not swift enough to stop requests of the opposition to be heard.

One of the immediately apparent manifestations of the real purposes back of the legislation is its failure to include provision that there shall be neither discrimination nor segregation in the proposed regional schools.

Even if the Congress is either so deluded or dishonest as to approve Senate Joint Resolution 191 and its House counterpart, it can be safely predicted that the constitutionality of the legislation will be promptly and unequivocally challenged in the courts. The establishment or attempted establishment of regional schools for Negroes while existing State graduate and professional schools for whites continue in operation will be in direct opposition to the entire trend of United States Supreme Court decisions of the past decade.

This attempt of the South, aided and encouraged by Messrs. Young and Carmichael, provides an ironic as well as amusing commentary on the current revolt of some of these same southern governors who emit daily tirades against northern and Federal interference. An Associated Press dispatch from Gainesville, Fla., dated March 5, reports that the Southern Regional Educational Council proposed a \$76,400 budget to get its plan for cooperative schools rolling. The story adds that "the funds will be sought from several philanthropic educational organizations," presumably from way down south on Fifth Avenue in New York City where the offices of the Carnegie Corp. are located.

These same governors threaten virtually every act of nonviolence or violence against congressional legislation to abolish lynching, the poll tax, and job discrimination. But it seems to have no reluctance in asking the same Congress to enact Federal legislation to enable the South to perpetuate educational discrimination and segregation and to circumvent the clear and unmistakable mandate of the United States Supreme Court. We can believe that the southern governors are honest only when they come into court as well as the Congress with clean hands by abolishing the legal fiction and judicial myth of separate but equal facilities.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend to Members of the House House Concurrent Resolution 133, which

would give congressional authority to the interstate education compacts proposed by 15 Southern States as the best method of improving facilities for higher education. The educational implications of this proposal are tremendous. The various States, by combining their resources, can make available to the young people of that section, both white and Negro, a system of higher education that the States, acting individually, could not afford.

This plan was devised after a series of conferences and months of investigations by the chief executives of the 15 States and their educational advisers. It is a sound plan, and one that can only result in a higher standard for the South.

The State and Federal Governments should cooperate to the fullest extent in providing adequate educational opportunities, and this compact is a long step in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOLLIVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 551, he reported the resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 45, answered "present" 1, not voting 149, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—236

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Abernethy | Beall | Byrne, N. Y. |
| Albert | Beckworth | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Allen, Calif. | Bennett, Mich. | Camp |
| Allen, Ill. | Bishop | Canfield |
| Allen, La. | Blackney | Cannon |
| Andersen, | Boggs, La. | Chapman |
| H. Carl | Bradley | Chelf |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Bramblett | Chilperfield |
| Angell | Brehm | Church |
| Arends | Brooks | Clark |
| Arnold | Brown, Ga. | Clason |
| Auchincloss | Bulwinkle | Coffin |
| Banta | Burleson | Cole, Kans. |
| Barrett | Busbey | Cole, Mo. |
| Bates, Mass. | Butler | Cole, N. Y. |

| | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| Combs | Holmes | Rayburn |
| Cooley | Hope | Redden |
| Cooper | Hull | Reed, Ill. |
| Corbett | Jenison | Reed, N. Y. |
| Cotton | Jensen | Rees |
| Coudert | Johnson, Calif. | Regan |
| Courtney | Johnson, Ill. | Rich |
| Cox | Johnson, Tex. | Riley |
| Cravens | Jones, N. C. | Rizley |
| Crow | Jones, Wash. | Robertson |
| Cunningham | Jonkman | Rogers, Mass. |
| Curtis | Judd | Rohrbough |
| Dague | Kean | Ross |
| Davis, Ga. | Keefe | Russell |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kefauver | Sadlak |
| Davis, Wis. | Kilday | St. George |
| Dawson, Utah | Landis | Sanborn |
| Deane | Lanham | Sarbacher |
| Dolliver | Latham | Sasser |
| Domeneaux | LeCompte | Schwabe, Okla. |
| Dondero | LeFevre | Seely-Brown |
| Donohue | Lemke | Shafer |
| Dorn | Lodge | Short |
| Doughton | Love | Simpson, Ill. |
| Durham | Lucas | Simpson, Pa. |
| Eaton | Lusk | Smith, Kans. |
| Elliot | Lyle | Smith, Va. |
| Ellis | McDonough | Snyder |
| Elsaesser | McGarvey | Spence |
| Engel, Mich. | McMahon | Stanley |
| Evins | McMillen, Ill. | Stefan |
| Fellows | Mack | Stevenson |
| Fenton | Macy | Stockman |
| Fernandez | Mahon | Stratton |
| Fisher | Martin, Iowa | Taber |
| Flannagan | Mason | Talle |
| Fletcher | Meyer | Teague |
| Folger | Michener | Thomas, Tex. |
| Foot | Miller, Md. | Thompson |
| Fuller | Miller, Nebr. | Tibbott |
| Gallagher | Mills | Tollefson |
| Gamble | Morris | Towe |
| Gathings | Morrison | Trimble |
| Gavin | Muhlenberg | Twyman |
| Gearhart | Murdock | Vail |
| Gillette | Murray, Tenn. | Van Zandt |
| Goff | Murray, Wis. | Vinson |
| Goodwin | Nicholson | Vorys |
| Gore | Norblad | Vursell |
| Gossett | O'Hara | Wadsworth |
| Gregory | O'Konski | Walter |
| Gross | Pace | Whitaker |
| Gwinn, N. Y. | Passman | Whitten |
| Gwynne, Iowa | Patterson | Whittington |
| Hale | Philbin | Wigglesworth |
| Hall | Phillips, Calif. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Leonard W. | Phillips, Tenn. | Winstead |
| Hardy | Pickett | Wolcott |
| Harris | Plumley | Wolverton |
| Hart | Poage | Wood |
| Hébert | Potter | Woodruff |
| Herter | Potts | Worley |
| Heslton | Preston | Youngblood |
| Hinshaw | Priest | |
| Hobbs | Rankin | |

NAYS—45

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Bloom | Griffiths | Lynch |
| Brophy | Hagen | MacKinnon |
| Buchanan | Havener | Mansfield |
| Buck | Heffernan | Marcantonio |
| Buckley | Hollifield | Miller, Conn. |
| Buffett | Huber | Morgan |
| Burke | Isacson | Multer |
| Carroll | Jackson, Wash. | O'Brien |
| Dawson, Ill. | Karsten, Mo. | Owens |
| Delaney | Keating | Powell |
| Devitt | Kelley | Price, Ill. |
| Fogarty | Kennedy | Sabath |
| Forand | Keogh | Sadowski |
| Gordon | King | Somers |
| Gorski | Klein | Welch |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall, Edwin Arthur

NOT VOTING—149

| | | |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbitt | Carson | Feighan |
| Anderson, Calif. | Case, N. J. | Fulton |
| Andresen, | Case, S. Dak. | Garmatz |
| August H. | Celler | Gary |
| Andrews, Ala. | Chadwick | Gillie |
| Bakewell | Chenoweth | Graham |
| Barden | Clevenger | Granger |
| Bates, Ky. | Clippinger | Grant, Ala. |
| Battle | Colmer | Grant, Ind. |
| Bell | Crawford | Halleck |
| Bender | Crosser | Hand |
| Bennett, Mo. | D'Ewart | Harless, Ariz. |
| Bland | Dingell | Harness, Ind. |
| Blatnik | Dirksen | Harrison |
| Boggs, Del. | Douglas | Hartley |
| Bolton | Eberharter | Harvey |
| Bonner | Ellsworth | Hays |
| Boykin | Elston | Hedrick |
| Brown, Ohio | Engle, Calif. | Hendricks |
| Bryson | Fallon | Hess |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Hill | McCormack | Ramey |
| Hoeven | McCowan | Reeves |
| Hoffman | McCulloch | Richards |
| Horan | McDowell | Riehlman |
| Jackson, Calif. | McGregor | Rivers |
| Jarman | McMillan, S. C. | Rockwell |
| Javits | Madden | Rogers, Fla. |
| Jenkins, Ohio | Maloney | Rooney |
| Jenkins, Pa. | Manasco | Schwabe, Mo. |
| Jennings | Mathews | Scoblick |
| Johnson, Ind. | Meade, Ky. | Scott, Hardie |
| Johnson, Okla. | Meade, Md. | Scott, |
| Jones, Ala. | Morrow | Hugh, D., Jr. |
| Kearney | Miller, Calif. | Scrivner |
| Kearns | Mitchell | Sheppard |
| Kee | Monroney | Sikes |
| Kerr | Morton | Smathers |
| Kersten, Wis. | Mundt | Smith, Maine |
| Kilburn | Nixon | Smith, Ohio |
| Kirwan | Nodar | Smith, Wis. |
| Knutson | Norrell | Stigler |
| Kunkel | Norton | Sundstrom |
| Lane | O'Toole | Taylor |
| Larcade | Patman | Thomas, N. J. |
| Lea | Peden | Weichel |
| Lesinski | Peterson | West |
| Lewis, Ky. | Pfeifer | Wheeler |
| Lewis, Ohio | Ploeser | Williams |
| Lichtenwalter | Poulson | Wilson, Ind. |
| Ludlow | Price, Fla. | |
| McConnell | Rains | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abbt for, with Mrs. Douglas against.
Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. McMullan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Eberharter against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Halleck with Mr. Bryson.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Engle of California.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Smathers.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Rogers of Florida.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Cresser.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Harless of Arizona.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Ramey with Mr. West.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Reeves with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Schwabe of Missouri with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Larcade.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Manasco.

Mr. Carson with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. McCowan with Mr. Peden.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Peterson.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Bland.

Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. BUFFETT changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT BILL

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of general debate on House Joint Resolution 334.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the remarks of Lucian O. Hunter, Jr., post commander, at a luncheon given in honor of Speaker MARTIN by AMVETS Post, No. 19, on Monday, May 3.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a citizen's letter on the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Kenneth F. Kressler on Tuesday, April 20.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter on the Marshall plan.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by a constituent.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Ralph Hendershot.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in respect to Polish Constitution Day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

CHRYSLER WORKERS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an advertisement that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.)

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Post appeared a statement by the Chrysler workers' local union, which is one of the finest statements I have seen put out by any organization at any time. It is particularly interesting and I commend it very highly to every Member of the House. I likewise want to commend the CIO union for bringing this matter to the attention of the people.

I believe that the statements made require an answer from the Chrysler Corp.

This statement says that the Chrysler workers need a wage increase and that Chrysler can pay it and cut car prices, too.

The profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were 50 percent higher than the average for all corporations in the highly profitable automobile industry. The profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 came to 25.6 percent on its investment. Chrysler profits were so great in 1947 that they could have cut retail prices \$145 on every car and still have made 8 percent on its investment.

Mr. Speaker, this complete statement by the Chrysler workers follows:

CHRYSLER WORKERS NEED A WAGE INCREASE—CHRYSLER CAN PAY IT AND CUT CAR PRICES, TOO

HERE'S PROOF

The corporation profits

1. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947—fasten your seat belt—50 percent higher than the average for all corporations in the highly profitable automobile industry.

2. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947, after taxes, came to 25.6 percent on its investment. The industry average was 17 percent.

3. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were so great that each Chrysler worker produced 68 cents in profit for the corporation every hour he worked.

4. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were so great that it could have cut retail prices \$145 on every car it produced

last year and still have made 8 percent on its investment.

5. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 prove that the corporation can grant every Chrysler worker a 30-cent-per-hour wage increase and still make 14½ percent on its investment, after taxes. It can cut prices, grant the wage increase and still make a good 6 to 8 percent on investment.

The workers' needs

1. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, like other American workers, have taken the rap for the reactionary crime of destroying price controls in the summer of 1946. Since that time, profits after taxes have gone up 57 percent—but wages and salaries have gone up only 18 percent. Profits rose over three times as fast as the income of the workers. Industry wanted the profits of inflation—and got them.

2. The Chrysler workers: The family of the average Chrysler worker must live on an income of \$13 below the minimum weekly income fixed by the United States Bureau of the Budget for a city worker's family of four.

3. The Chrysler workers: The average auto worker's earnings rose 12 percent between June 1946 and January 1948—but the cost of living went up 27 percent.

4. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler worker's family could afford less than 90 percent of the food, clothing, and other necessities which the breadwinner's pay check could buy in the month price controls were destroyed (June 1946).

5. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, through their union, repeatedly called on Congress and Big Business to roll back prices, and made it clear that they would prefer a price roll-back to a wage increase. Both Congress and industry ignored that call. Since prices were not rolled back, and since they will continue to rise, a wage increase is necessary. The Chrysler workers refuse to take the rap for the reactionary crime of inflation.

CHRYSLER'S OWN FIGURES PROVE UAW CASE

Here, from Chrysler's own 1947 annual report, are the figures that prove that the Chrysler Corp. can pay the wage increase asked by Chrysler workers and still make extravagant profits.

Fact 1: Chrysler's pay roll last year, including President K. T. Keller's salary, was \$259,148,583.

Fact 2: Our 30-cent demand, with equivalent percentage increases for white-collar workers, amounts to 21.1 percent of the total pay roll, or \$54,680,351.

Fact 3: Chrysler's 1947 profits before taxes amounted to \$123,657,346.¹

Fact 4 (fact 3 minus fact 2): After a 21.1 percent pay-roll increase to Chrysler workers, Chrysler's profits before taxes would still be \$68,966,995.

Fact 5: Income taxes would then take \$28,614,406.²

Fact 6 (fact 4 minus fact 5): Leaving profits after taxes of \$40,352,589.

Fact 7: Stockholders' total investment in the corporation at the beginning of 1947 was \$282,912,028.

Fact 8 (fact 6 as a percentage of fact 7): Chrysler's rate of profit, after a 21.1 percent wage and salary increase and after taxes, would be 14¼ percent.

THE A, B, C OF THE CHRYSLER WORKERS' WAGE DEMANDS

A. The Chrysler Corp. can increase wages without raising prices.

¹ This profit figure includes \$5,166,126 charged by the corporation for extraordinary depreciation. This deduction is inconsistent with the corporation's past policy and probably will not be recognized by the U. S. Treasury for tax purposes.

² Chrysler figured its tax payments at 41.49 percent of its profits before taxes. We used the same percentage.

B. The Chrysler workers need this wage increase to recover lost ground and make a little progress.

C. The issue can be settled peacefully on the basis of the facts.

Will the Chrysler Corp. heed the facts? Chrysler workers want to know.

NATIONAL CHRYSLER DEPARTMENT AND CHRYSLER LOCAL UNIONS, UAW-CIO.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, according to a statement made by one of our colleagues it is hardly parliamentarily correct to follow the addressing of the Speaker by addressing the Members of the House; but on this particular occasion I wish to say to those who are present and to those who by any chance might read in the RECORD what I have to say on this occasion that I am addressing myself in that way at the present time.

I am thinking about that which is most important to all of us—the question of, Where are we going? What is our destination? I am speaking from a consideration of world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for ECA, ERP or the Marshall plan, whichever you might decide to call it, feeling that it was destined to aid us in the reestablishment of a democratic life particularly in Europe and finally with something of a gesture toward China.

The word "communism" has become something of a byword which condemns every segment and section of people anywhere under any circumstances. Of course, we realize that communism is a definite danger and a definite threat to the world as well as a terrible life for any people to live under in any domain. But if we make the mistake in our earnest and justified effort to eliminate the influences of communism in our own country and as far as we may in other lands, we should not forget that there is such a thing as totalitarian government on the other side and there will never be an end or the consummation of an end to be desired with respect to communism as long as we have tyrannical, totalitarian, undemocratic, unrepresentative governments in other countries. People want to be free. They want to enjoy what we spoke about in our Constitution and in our Declaration of Rights as the privilege of enjoying the fruits of our own labor and pursuing happiness unhindered by authority, if you please, in high places.

Let me read you something. I have forgotten who wrote it, but I am sure that whoever it was will not accuse me of plagiarism in appropriating it on this occasion:

UNFINISHED ANTI-RED BUSINESS

In the midst of rejoicing over Communist defeats in Colombia and Italy, responsible leaders know that the Red problem in such countries is still unfinished business. Far more effective preventive measures are required. They are necessary on both international and national levels.

No country alone can deal adequately with a conspiracy which is international in origin, organization, and purpose. This is recognized

by the Colombian Government and by the Inter-American Conference in Bogota, which the Reds almost succeeded in killing. So the 21 nations there have agreed unanimously to cooperate in urgent measures to prevent agents in the service of international communism, or of any other totalitarianism, from tampering with the true will of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Likewise the Italian Government is seeking membership in the new western European defensive alliance against Russian aggression and penetration.

While these international agreements are essential, they are not sufficient. At best they can reduce Moscow interference. But they cannot cure the unhealthy national conditions in which communism breeds and thrives. That can be done only by drastic social and economic reforms not yet attempted by either Italy or most Latin-American countries.

In Colombia and many of her sister republics, the chasm between the small rich ruling class and the impoverished semi-illiterate people is dangerously deep and wide. No amount of suppression can permanently prevent revolution against such conditions, or prevent the better organized Red underground from capturing those popular revolts when they occur. Decent living and working conditions, equal economic and educational opportunities, must be included in any democracy strong enough to withstand totalitarianism from left or right.

In Italy the left wing, despite its defeat, polled nearly half a million more votes than 2 years ago. Almost one-third of all Italians went along with the Commies. They did this in the face of warnings by their church and by their American relatives, in disregard of the announcement that United States relief and Marshall plan aid would be cut off by Red victory, despite Stalin's refusal to return Trieste, and despite the horrible example of Soviet enslavement of Czechoslovakia and eastern Europe.

Most of those 8,000,000 Italian voters are not Stalinists at heart and not traitors. They are simply the hopeless and misguided poor—the landless peasants, the unemployed workers, the middle-class victims of inflation and black market.

We do not believe that country is now or will be safe from revolution until the inhuman poverty of Italy's millions is alleviated—until Marshall plan recovery is allowed to seep down to those who need it most.

For that reason we are tremendously impressed by the postelection statements of the Pope and the Premier. Premier de Gasperi now will have a sufficient parliamentary majority to put through any legislation he desires. He pledges agrarian reform, fairer distribution of wealth, and "ever-quickenings steps toward conditions corresponding ever more closely to social justice."

Pope Pius XII says the election victory "should hasten material social reconstruction of the country so necessary if justice is to be done to all, especially to the workingman and the unemployed."

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that our pitiable attempt to bolster the government in China is a futile one simply because of the fact that there are so many underprivileged, underfed, despairing, destitute, more or less, in that country, whose plight does not appeal to the government in charge, and that we will find our efforts quite in vain unless we strive by moral persuasion and, if you please, by warning, that we will not support a government that does not offer liberty and freedom and democracy to its citizens. I am afraid, too, that in Greece we will never have the elimination of that element and that program which

has obtained in Greece and which we ascribe largely to communism, and probably unjustifiably so, until by moral suasion or warning we tell the totalitarian Government of Greece that she must put her house in order and recognize everyone within that boundary as a citizen of that country entitled to all of the benefits that mankind can enjoy and which his diligence and his thoughts and his desires may lead him to.

A great headline in the afternoon paper says, "Greeks execute 152 in 1 day in wake of Minister's slaying."

For what? The charges that they say were made in 1944, but they were slain because to them was attributed the death of the Minister of Greece. I cannot make an accusation about that, but I do think that with all that we are trying to do to reestablish democratic thought and living within the countries of this world we ought to have something to say to the tyrannical, totalitarian, undemocratic governments of the countries we are pouring our money into and with it our hopes for readjustment and the establishment of a better government. If we do not, and if we are not mindful of that and waste all that we have, including universal military training with all of its dislocations of our own citizens, especially the youth of the land, carrying along with it conscription and things of that kind, depending upon these to lift the world back to a status of democratic living, we may find ourselves as having lost all this if we do not try to accomplish these things at least with a purpose and with a determination as far as within us lies to teach and to urge the peoples of every country and the governments themselves particularly that their totalitarian regimes, their tyrannical conduct, make it impossible for us or anybody else to deliver them from the woes and the damnation of communism sooner or later.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Does the gentleman not believe it would be a good idea for us to be an example to the other nations of the world by showing our real freedom here in the things we do?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of my country that I will make hardly any mention of that situation now. Of course, we do often need amendments to our way of life. But I live in the very great faith that wherever mistakes are made, sooner or later this great democratic principle which permeates our population and our Government and our law-making power will correct those evils and bring to the United States as good a Government as is possible to be had.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman does say, then, we should be an example?

Mr. FOLGER. I think we occupy that position, where we should be an example, and that we should carry our influence by all the persuasion possible and by the example that we set to other nations that this democracy of free people is the only government that mankind ought to be required to live under.

Mr. OWENS. Putting youngsters into the Army without their consent in peacetime would hardly be the act of a free nation, would it?

Mr. FOLGER. I saw something today, Mr. Speaker, that I did not like at all. It is a repetition of something I have seen before, that men who do not think, honestly and truly, that with the exercise of this great power the Government has to reach down and get 18- and 19-year-old boys and put them into the service, and accompany that with a conscription law, are acting for a personal political benefit; and with great respect to him, I refer to some remarks that are attributed to Mr. Justice Roberts, a former Supreme Court Justice, in which he makes the charge that our Speaker and a Member of the Senate are moved in these things by the desire to get votes. I do not believe a word of it. For my own self, I repudiate such a suggestion. I am opposed to it and I am going to remain opposed to it until I see the necessity for it, whether I ever get another vote so long as I live; and I believe those men who are honestly opposed to it are opposing it on the same basis and for the same reason.

I can see no common sense in trusting to toy guns in an atomic age, where technical methods of defense have supplanted the outmoded means of pitiable inability.

The rule of reason ought to have some place in our thinking. We have the greatest Navy in the world. We may supplement it as research and progress may allow. One of our highest military men has said that so far as the Army is concerned we should maintain an army of reasonable proportions, but devote our energies, too, to the discovery and improvement of methods.

In considering what is adequate and competent, I remember that adequacy does not depend so much on the number of soldiers we have, but on the character of war mechanism we shall use. Have we not learned anything from Hiroshima or Nagasaki or Bikini?

And, again, do we hope to kill communism by supporting Fascist totalitarian governments, or by rebuilding the military power of Germany? I fear such a course will not reduce communism, but may well tend to its growth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEWITT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last week in the District court an indictment charging the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers' Cooperative and seven Washington milk-distributing companies with restraint of trade and conspiracy in price fixing was summarily dismissed on the grounds that under the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 a cooperative may not be

prosecuted for violation of the antitrust laws.

The court accepted the argument of the attorney for the secretary-treasurer of the cooperative, who said:

Elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative (and) . . . the very end and purpose of a cooperative.

That is a shocking statement, but what this lawyer went on to say presents an even more dangerous doctrine. He said:

When we act to eliminate competition, we're within our rights, so long as we do so in our own self-interest. Bet your life we try to deprive noncustomer retailers of their milk supply. We'll persuade them to come into our organization as customers if we can. And when we do so, we're fully within our rights in the economic struggle. We're fully authorized by Congress and protected by law, and unless the net result is undue price enhancement, we haven't violated the law.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that law was changed. I have previously pointed out that cooperative associations have three highly important privileges which are denied to other businesses: First, they may be wholly or largely exempt from payment of Federal income tax; second, farmer cooperatives are legally absolved from the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1933; third, farmer cooperatives are permitted—even encouraged—to create monopolies in restraint of trade under the liberal provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act.

This third privilege—freedom from prosecution under the antitrust laws—is being used today in direct violation of the public interest.

Through this legalized monopoly, the price of milk in the District of Columbia has been boosted to the highest figure in the Nation. Even in seasons of plenty, when milk prices are reduced in most cities over the country, Washington babies are deprived of the milk they need because it is in the self-interest of this monopolistic cooperative to kill competition and to prevent nonmember dealers from securing the supplies they might otherwise obtain and might sell at more reasonable prices.

I cannot believe that it was the purpose or intent of the authors of the Capper-Volstead Act to bring about such an unhappy result. In fact, it is clearly stated in the act that a cooperative may be prosecuted if it abuses the privilege of creating a monopoly or if it restrains trade by unduly enhancing prices.

The loophole in the law is its further provision that determination of what may constitute undue enhancement of prices is left solely within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture—though since the passage of the Capper-Volstead Act other powers and duties that have been imposed upon the Secretary of Agriculture have made it virtually impossible for him to bring monopoly action against any cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the Secretary of Agriculture is today contradictory and anomalous. Under the Agricultural Marketing Act, the Secretary is required to create artificially high prices for farm products, to the end that farmers may

be assured an adequate profit for their labors. Under the Capper-Volstead Act, it becomes his duty to prosecute these same unduly high prices in the interest of consumers.

The Secretary of Agriculture cannot serve two masters. If he is to protect high farm prices, he can hardly be expected to protect consumers against those high prices and the monopolies that establish them.

I have therefore introduced an amendment to the Capper-Volstead Act, H. R. 6423, to relieve the Secretary of Agriculture from the embarrassing position in which he now finds himself, and to place the responsibility of prosecuting cooperative monopoly and cooperative restraint of trade upon the shoulders of the Attorney General, through the Department of Justice.

If the Capper-Volstead Act is thus amended, there will be transferred to the Attorney General the duty of inquiring into those cases where cooperatives have unduly enhanced prices and to bring the necessary restraining action in the public interest. Through this transfer, checks and balances will be created which will permit a neutral umpire to determine whether a cooperative is taking undue advantage of its monopoly to raise prices to the detriment of the consuming public.

The legitimate aspirations of agriculture cannot be hampered by the enactment of this amendment. Cooperatives will still have the special privilege of creating monopoly, which is denied to other businesses, but a neutral umpire will be given the right to determine whether this special privilege is being abused.

Mr. Speaker, a conspiracy to which both cooperatives and other businesses are parties can now be prosecuted by the Department of Justice. This was done in 1941, when the California Fruit Growers Exchange and numerous selling agencies acting for the Sunkist co-op were indicted under Department of Justice action for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The cooperative entered a plea of nolo contendere and paid a fine of \$80,000. In the following year the Department of Justice, under Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, again brought action against the California Fruit Growers Exchange and other fruit shippers and auction companies, charging them with restricting markets, fixing prices, conspiring to eliminate competitors, and so forth. This was a civil action. The Sunkist co-op and other defendants denied their guilt, but agreed with the Government to the entry of a consent decree enjoining them from further restraint of trade. It is my understanding that that consent decree is still in effect.

Similar action might have been taken in the recent District of Columbia milk case, for other defendants besides the Maryland-Virginia co-op were named. The Court appears to have been in error in deciding that the Capper-Volstead Act fully applied.

The amendment I propose, giving full authority to the Department of Justice, will correct this situation and uphold

the hands of the Attorney General in the appeal which is to be taken and the prosecution of this milk monopoly which should then follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEWITT). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FORGOTTEN FAMILIES OF AMERICA

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing belief among the friends of the Gold Star wives of World War I that legislation in behalf of the forgotten families of America by Congress is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to speak frankly in terms of obligation and duty which this Government undertook by virtue of its calling the young men of the United States to enter the armed services to keep this country free and safe. My discussion, while keeping sentiment and good conscience in mind, is based upon what the Government, by implication if not directly, bound itself to do in return for services of husbands and fathers when it called them into the armed services.

This country has always been generous in providing for its war veterans and rightfully so. The men who risk their lives to defend their country deserve special recognition. The benefits of compensation for disabled men and the provisions of the GI bill, giving them education privileges and loan grants to aid them in business, are small, but just rewards for sacrifices they have made. For the young men and women who returned, at the end of the war, Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 were designed to assist with the readjustment to civilian life to make up for the years spent in Government service insofar as it was possible that this could be done.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico on her interest in and work on this legislation. A Gold Star Mother herself, there is no better qualified person in the House to speak on this legislation.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman.

For those who were interested, an opportunity was provided to complete their education interrupted by war; for those who wished to learn new skills, an on-the-job training program was provided. Those who had difficulty in securing employment again at the termination of military service, were assured of some income through a system of unemployment benefits for a period of 52 weeks.

There was little dissention for the wisdom of the program or its essential appropriateness. A grateful people were prepared to reward and repay in the most practical form for the magnificent effort these young men and women had made. It has worked well and will some day be called, I am sure, the wisest investment in its future, our Government ever made.

There are many other phases of these aid programs which I do not detail now because they are known to you. They

form parts of the whole pattern of readjustment of vets which Congress attempted to establish. To my mind that pattern in general terms was to discharge partially the obligations which the Government owes to those men and women who had saved our American way of life. I say the object was to discharge partially the obligation, because the sacrifices made can never be fully recompensed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to join the gentleman from Texas in complimenting the gentlewoman on the fine work she has done. She is an able legislator and has accomplished a great deal for the Gold Star Mothers of America. She herself is a Gold Star Mother. I should like to ask her in her capacity as a legislator if she is familiar with what happened to the bill yesterday sponsored by the Gold Star Mothers, the purpose of which was to set up three national cemeteries within the Nation, one in particular to serve the gentlewoman's area of New Mexico. I think the RECORD ought to show clearly who opposed that bill on the Consent Calendar, not so much the names of the individuals who objected to it, as the forces working in back of the scene, and with her permission I should like to take a minute.

Mrs. LUSK. I should be glad to hear the gentleman's discussion of the matter.

Mr. CARROLL. The purpose of the bill was to set up national cemeteries in order that the bodies of the veterans who died overseas, might be interred in a national cemetery if the next of kin of the deceased veteran so desired.

I think the RECORD should show that the Army can spend only \$75 for such burial. There are many people in this Nation who lost their children who cannot afford to spend more than \$75. On the other hand the private cemeteries will not provide space for interment for \$75 and the cost of burial exceeds many times the amount the Army can spend for a burial.

Here are the facts of the opposition to that legislation. The witnesses who appeared before the Public Lands Committee protesting said that this was evidence of the encroachment of the Federal Government into the field of private enterprise, that it was an example of how far the Federal Government would go in being unfair to the private enterprise system. The bill was objected to by the private cemeteries. The other day I was informed that the tombstone makers objected to the passage of this bill.

I think it is only fair to the Gold Star Mothers that these facts be brought to their attention. I think they should exert their influence on the Rules Committee so that the bill can be brought to the floor and have the membership put themselves on record. It has a very sordid tale in back of it, and I mention this for the RECORD in order that the people may know the forces moving behind the scenes to kill this legislation. Not only should the Gold Star Mothers themselves know what is going on, but the veterans also should know about the situation.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I think one goes a long way when one accuses Members of Congress of being on the side of the tombstone makers.

Mrs. LUSK. Perhaps it should not be said that Members of Congress side with the tombstone makers, but the fact they do not take action on the other side is still a mark against them.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentlewoman will yield further. I think the record speaks for itself and the record of the hearings before the Committee on Public Lands is there for anyone of the public who wants to read it. I think that an investigation, and debate on the floor of this House, will reveal the forces that are at work. It is to be said that this bill did not originate with me. It originated with Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts. Cemeteries were to be established in Massachusetts, at Fort Lewis, Wash., and in Fort Logan, Colo.

The Fort Logan Cemetery was to serve the Rocky Mountain area. I am not impugning the motives of the Members themselves because I do not think they understand fully except one with whom I talked and he said that the granite industry of his State was objecting to the bill.

That is why I make the statement before this body. I am sorry to take the gentlewoman's time, but as a legislator interested in veterans, I am hoping that the gentlewoman of New Mexico, a Gold Star Mother, will advise this group to appear before the Rules Committee so that we may have a full hearing on this important legislation.

Mrs. LUSK. I am glad to have the information and I think it should be re-emphasized for every interested person to read.

One part of the pattern is incomplete and that incomplete part is made more noticeable by the thought and attention which have been given to perfecting the other parts. Do not misunderstand me. I believe our effort should not slacken as to the part of the program already started, but the picture of what has not been done is made clearer by comparison with that which has been done, and it is obvious now that we should give immediate attention to correction of what makes the pattern so out of balance.

The provisions made for the wives and children of those men who made the greater sacrifices and gave their lives, have not been so generous. It does not become the Government charged with legislation for the public welfare, to ignore this situation. It smacks of the kind of negligence which fosters lack of confidence in the Government. These young women whose husbands lives were lost should not be denied the rewards that would be due the veteran had he lived to claim them.

Speaking generally, it seems to me that the Government should make available to the dependents of the members of the armed forces, the same benefits which

were made available to members of the armed forces who did return.

The law as presently written denies to the children and wives of deceased veterans the opportunities so generously extended by the Government to returning veterans, their wives, and children. Discriminated against are the dependents of those men whose sacrifices for their country were the greatest. No provision was made for extending to these dependents the helpful benefits of the GI bill of rights, although it seems to me that their claim is equally as great and it represents to my mind a breach of faith on the part of the Government.

As indicated, every member of the armed forces has the right to expect that his family would be the recipient in equal amounts with every other member's family, the benefits which naturally accrue to families under the GI bill of rights. Having that right to expect such benefits for his family, it is wrong now not to make substitute provisions for families of deceased veterans.

The problem is complicated but not insurmountable. The existing provisions of law give the average widow with one child a pension of \$78 per month. It is unnecessary for me to say that these few dollars cannot compensate them for their loss. No amount of money could fully do that, but these courageous women want and deserve the opportunity to help themselves. In a large number of the cases, the widow who has found herself suddenly in the position of having to provide for herself and children, to determine her own future, is in need of help. She faces just as difficult a problem of readjustment as ever faced the returned serviceman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I add my voice to those who have already commended the gentlewoman from New Mexico on the splendid statement she is giving to the House, as well as for the wonderful work she has done on behalf of the veterans as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a veteran of World War II, and I probably should say a disabled veteran, I agree with the gentlewoman wholeheartedly in the statements she has expressed on the floor today and may I say that, in my opinion, no one is more deserving of the gratitude of the American people than those who have had their loved ones make the supreme sacrifice so that we in the United States might continue to be a land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is to ignore realities to contend that the present level of compensation paid to dependents of deceased members of the armed forces is adequate. It is also to ignore realities to believe that there is equality in the law for the men who served in the armed forces during World War II.

Legislation should be enacted that would give the wives of servicemen an opportunity to make a place for themselves in the economic life of the commu-

nity under Public Law 346. They should be granted educational benefits that would prepare and equip them to provide for their children and for their own future. They should be granted the loan benefits for the purchase of homes for themselves and their children, or that they may enter into gainful business to provide a livelihood. The enterprise and courage of our modern women has proven equal to the obstacles of competitive business.

The children of men who did not return home again should be permitted to receive the educational legacy their fathers did not return to collect.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill to provide for extension of loan benefits of Public Law 346 to the widows and children of the men who died in service. My colleagues on the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Judge RAMEY; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS] have introduced measures to extend other benefits of the law to dependents of veterans.

We realize that the children of the men who gave their lives in service have been handicapped seriously by the loss of their fathers. It is our obligation to see that these wives and children are given a chance in this land of equal opportunity, to make a place for themselves in the world. These forgotten families of America must be given the full measure of reward that their husbands and fathers would have been entitled to receive had they returned.

It is not my purpose to be critical of the work that Congress has done. There has been a tremendous amount of legislation to consider. But I would like to stress that this young group of Gold Star wives could be helped very materially if the veterans' service organizations—the VFW, American Legion, and AMVETS, who clearly understand their need would lend a hand in securing early consideration of much-needed legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I have been very much disappointed that there has not been a single veteran's organization that has made any effort in behalf of legislation for the widows and orphans. I remember reading last year where the national convention did pass a resolution supporting this legislation, but I have seen no action by the different groups here in Washington.

Mrs. LUSK. I would like to say again that I think it is really the responsibility of the service groups to assist these young women, the Gold Star wives, to initiate this work. Many of these women are inexperienced. Lately they have become more aggressive and they are making some headway, but they could be helped a great deal if the VFW, the American Legion and the Amvets would get behind their plans and help them to secure the proper legislation before Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to add my voice to that of my colleagues here, young men who are veterans of the recent war. I know what the gentlewoman from New Mexico has been doing in her efforts, and I want to commend her. I feel we are too prone to give lip service to those who made the supreme sacrifice. I want to help the gentlewoman in her efforts to give more than mere lip service to those who defended and made this land a safe place for us.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman. I would like to say that it would be becoming of more Members of Congress to make the same statement and to lend the same efforts. After, all this Nation owes a debt of honor to the heroes who gave their lives, and a more fitting memorial to the memory of the men who gave their lives could not be offered than to provide educational benefits for their children under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would just like to say that I commend the gentlewoman as one of the most outstanding Members of the House, and a very valued Member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. It has been my privilege to sit on the committee with the gentlewoman and to cooperate and work with her. I know of no member who has devoted more sincere and earnest and capable service for the benefit of World War veterans than has the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. Lusk]. She is a very valued Member of the Congress and a very popular one.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. There is one thing that men who were in danger of being killed wanted to know, that is, that their mothers and fathers and wives and children would be taken care of. I, for one, certainly do not believe this country has done what it should have in behalf of the mothers and fathers and the widows and orphans of the boys who were killed.

Mrs. LUSK. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress the fact that I have thought for a long time about fitting memorials that would be of service, and I believe an educational program for the children left behind would be most appreciated by future generations as well as by the boys who made the sacrifice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Hartford (Conn.) Times entitled "Authorization for the Extermination of Mice from a Post Office."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, support and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; and

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1519. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a printed copy of the report on the agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1520. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the first quarterly report for the calendar year of 1948, covering the period from January 1 through March 31; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1521. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 574. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6342, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 575. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 342, joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HORAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6430. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2256. An act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5871. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6396. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 6430. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6431. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6432. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6433. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to add to the free list certain books and music to be used for reference purposes, and for certain other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6434. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6435. A bill to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6436. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6437. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 6439. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 6440. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6441. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6442. A bill to establish a procedure for the appointment of postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6443. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6444. A bill to enact the National Voluntary Enlistment Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 576. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4488; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 577. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to motions to strike from the Record the remarks of Members; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 578. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business to conduct a study and investigation of certain monopolistic practices; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6446. A bill to grant a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Max Schlomowitz (also known as Alec Frederick Reeves); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

1864. By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Mrs. Lorna M. Schuette and 148 other voters of Latah County, First Congressional District of the State of Idaho, in favor of a world federal government with limited powers adequate to maintain peace, and urging adoption by the Congress of the United States of Senate Concurrent Resolution 24 and House Concurrent Resolutions 59-68 calling for Charter revision to enable the United Nations to enact, interpret, and enforce world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1865. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Citizens Protective League, Inc.; petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation for an American War Criminals Code for punishment of American military and civilian officials who during the war and since then have in this country violated their oaths of office by misuse of positions of authority or neglect of duty for purposes of monetary or other personal gain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1866. Also, petition of J. C. Michael and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1867. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner National Housing Commission bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 4, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, come nearer to us than we have ever known and stay with us through the deliberations of this day, lest we give way to selfishness.

We pray for our country, thrust by world events into high responsibility.

May she be willing to grow up, and, with adult maturity, looking unto Thee for guidance and wisdom and courage, assume her role of leader among the nations.

So may her statesmen act and her people think that Thou canst bless her and use her.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 4, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans; and

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; and

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.